RUSSIA IN TRANSFORMATION

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

UNITY AND MISSIONS

12mo, cloth . . . . . net $1.50

The Continent:—"Should be really credited with being epoch-making."

Missionary Survey:—"This is truly a great book."

ROBERT H. GARDINER, *Secretary of the Commission on a World Conference on Faith and Order*:—"A very useful book. I have commended it frequently and I have lately presented a copy to the library of a very influential society of Episcopalian women."

Presbyterian Banner:—"There have been many books on the subject of Christian Unity, but this is the noblest of them all—comprehensive, calm and convincing. It is a great book, lofty in thought, noble in spirit, and breathing the true spirit of Christian charity and unity."

Outlook of Missions:—"As yet nothing has been written that so comprehensively covers the great questions which he undertakes to answer."

Christian Advocate (*N. Y.*):—"The wide knowledge of the subject he displays, his straightforwardness, his broad catholicity in the treatment of controversial questions, his intense earnestness, and his unfailing courage—all combine to take him in this book along a pathway that is far above the plane of any beaten track."

MRS. HENRY W. PEABODY:—"The book seems wonderful to me. It is written with great courage and understanding."

Christian Work: "A remarkable survey of the progress of unity. Dr. Brown writes in such a masterly and convincing manner that his book challenges the Western Church."

W. H. P. FAUNCE, *President Brown University*:—"Rarely have I read anything that so stirred my blood and cleared my vision. It will do a mighty work in wide regions."

THE FOREIGN MISSIONARY

12mo, cloth . . . . . net $1.50

DR. JOHN R. MOTT:—"The strongest thing that has ever appeared bearing on the life and work of the missionary."

The New York Times:—"A thoroughly sane book is a thing of beauty and a joy. Such is Dr. Brown's book on missions. He writes in excellent English with a fine sense of humor. This book is especially adapted for two classes of persons—those who believe in Foreign Missions and those who don't."

DR. EUGENE STOCK, *former Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, London*:—"An Englishman interested in Foreign Missions cannot but regard with admiring envy the books which America is producing on that subject. We of the old country have done nothing that can be compared with them. And certainly we ought to be grateful for this one. It is simply admirable. We really do not see where criticism could be successfully offered. Every member of a missionary board ought to read and pass an examination in this book before he presumes to take his part in missionary administration; and every missionary should go through the same experience before he sets sail for the foreign field."

The Intercollegian:—"The classic for many years to come. It should be a vade mecum for every volunteer and missionary."

RUSSIA IN TRANSFORMATION

BY

ARTHUR JUDSON BROWN

Author of "Unity and Missions," "The Foreign Missionary," "New Forces in Old China," "The New Era in the Philippines," "The Chinese Revolution," "The Why and How of Foreign Missions," "Rising Churches in Non-Christian Lands," etc., etc.

NEW YORK CHICAGO TORONTO

Fleming H. Revell Company

LONDON AND EDINBURGH

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
Chicago: 17 N. Wabash Ave.
Toronto: 25 Richmond St., W.
London: 21 Paternoster Square
Edinburgh: 100 Princes Street

FOREWORD

THE transformation of Russia is prominent among the notable events of this extraordinary period in the world's history. The present situation is naturally a disturbed one and its swiftly changing phases cause alternations of hope and fear. Years may pass before the new Russia will settle down to stability of life and administration so that an observer can view the entire revolutionary movement in clear perspective. Meantime, we may be helped in understanding the situation and be led into deeper sympathy with our Russian brethren if we take a bird'seye view of the conditions which led up to the Revolution and made it inevitable, note the salient features of the Revolution itself, take into account the serious difficulties that beset the path of its leaders, and remind ourselves of some of the fundamental characteristics of national attitude and ambition which will undoubtedly affect the policy of the new Russia whatever may be the immediate outcome of present occurrences. This little book is therefore offered, not as a final account of a move-

ment that is still in progress, but as a tentative study of what has taken place thus far and of some of the factors that are likely to influence future developments. Parts of the chapters on the Revolution and Constantinople have appeared in "Asia, the Journal of the American Asiatic Association."

A. J. B.

156 Fifth Avenue,
New York.

CONTENTS

I

THE AUTOCRATIC RUSSIA OF THE TSAR

RECENT events have deepened the interest of thoughtful men in Russia. A nation so vast in population, in territory and in resources, and so distinctive in character and purpose, would be a fascinating study at any time, and it is now doubly so. In order that the significance of the Revolution may be understood, it is necessary to remind ourselves in outline of the conditions against which the revolt was made.

The old Russia was autocratic and despotic in every sphere of life and activity. An American cannot consistently criticise the restrictions which Russia imposed upon international trade, for his own country has long been notorious for protective tariffs. Most men engage in business "for revenue only," and Russia, like the United States, enforced commercial regulations with sole reference to her own aggrandizement. America had some

trade with Russia because the latter needed many of our manufactured articles, especially agricultural implements and railway supplies; but the foreign business man who innocently imagined that he would be free to trade in Russian territory on any other terms than those which Russian officials considered for their own interests had an experience which made him a sadder and a wiser man.

Whatever excuse there may have been for this on the plane of that self-interest which usually characterizes money-getting everywhere, there could be none for Russia's absolutism in other spheres of human life.

The press was not free. Every newspaper was under the rigid surveillance of a censor. Articles to which he objected were prohibited under heavy penalties. One journal was suppressed because it contained an article on "The Woman Question," another because of an article on "Liberty of Conscience," another because it discussed "Contemporary Science," and a fourth because the censor declared that the editor was "too light-minded," though one wonders with George Kennan, who gives these facts, how a Russian editor could be "light-minded" with the heavy hand of the censor

upon him. No other land was under an "intellectual barbarism to compare with the newspaper censorship in Russia." No one was spared. March 13, 1914, the High Court of St. Petersburg sentenced to imprisonment for two years the seventy-year-old M. Baudouin de Courtenay, an Actual Councillor of State and Emeritus Professor of St. Petersburg University, for publishing a pamphlet entitled "The National and Territorial Characteristics of Autonomy," in which sympathy was expressed for the federal system of government.

Popular education was more backward than in any other civilized land. Illiteracy was and still is the rule rather than the exception among the common people. No other country in Europe has so many ignorant peasants in proportion to population. Only four and a half million children were then enrolled in schools, about twenty-five per cent. of the children of school age, and expenditures for education were a mere pittance of twelve millions, or eight cents per capita. Said a well-informed observer: "While Russia has many great scholars and men of letters, her whole theory of education and scholarship is one of repression, of the crushing out of freedom of critical thought."

When an American visitor in Russia, conversing with an educated Russian of high personal character, expressed his indignant protest against recent efforts of revolutionists to assassinate high officials, the Russian gentleman told him that, when a university student, his room was searched by the police and he was arrested and thrown into a dungeon because a copy of Emerson's Essays was found. He was finally released, but was again arrested because another police visit disclosed a volume of Herbert Spencer's writings. The police continued to ransack his room at frequent intervals, and arrested him a third time because they discovered Mill's Essay on Liberty. Meantime, his sister, a beautiful, intelligent girl, was imprisoned for no other cause than that she was related to him as a suspected man. Her jailers treated her with such brutality and outrage that she developed a disease which, intensified by grief and shame, resulted in her death.

The horrified American exclaimed: "Why did you not appeal to the courts?" "Because every judge in Russia is the creature of the autocracy," was the answer. "Why did you not give publicity to these facts?"

"Because every printed line in Russia passes under the eye of the censor." "Why did you not appeal to the Tsar?" "Because the Tsar cannot be reached; he is surrounded by an impregnable wall." "Then," said the American, realizing that the man was absolutely without redress after the most appalling outrages, "I should have killed somebody." "Ah," said the Russian, "You have become a Destructionist in an hour; it took eight years to make one of me." [1]

The regulations regarding passports illustrated the iron grip of the autocracy upon the life of the people. The passport which the traveller obtained from his own government had to be viséd by the Russian Consul before leaving the country. It had to be shown not only at the frontier of Russia but at every stopping-place within it. No hotel or boarding house in all Russia was permitted to give a night's lodging to a visitor until his passport had been sent to the public station and approved; nor could one get out of a town without special permission. A Russian was not allowed to welcome a stranger to his house

[1] Cf. article by George Kennan in "The Outlook," February 25, 1905.

without notifying the police and receiving their consent. One was supposed to present the passport in person at the police station, but in the leading cities the hotel management usually sent a foreigner's passport by a messenger to the police, who kept it until he was ready to depart, when it was returned to him. Once in the country, one could not leave it unless, at the last stopping-place, he notified the chief of police that he desired to do so. The permit was entered upon the passport, and when the train reached the frontier, the police examined the document to see that it contained the requisite permission.

It was therefore exceedingly difficult for a Russian who was under suspicion to get out of the country, or to escape from prison, or from exile in Siberia. Whenever he entered even the smallest village or the humblest inn, his passport was called for, and if it was not forthcoming, arrest was prompt. The Russian Empire, like the Roman of old, was a safe and dreary prison for those who were under the ban of the Government and who had committed no other offence than the kind of an opinion regarding the Government which thousands of Americans shout in safety from

the housetops. Judging from the care which was exercised, Russia should have been free from " undesirable citizens," and it was therefore something of a shock to find that there were as many bad characters in proportion to the population as there were in other lands. The object of the passport regulations of course was political rather than criminal. Short of robbery and murder, one could do almost anything he pleased in Russia without interference from the police, as long as he was not suspected of harbouring revolutionary designs.

Grant that an autocratic government, in constant fear of revolution, naturally desired to know what persons were entering or moving about the Empire. The identity of innocent persons, both native and foreign, could have been established without so many irritating technicalities as the Government insisted upon. The regulations subjected the traveller to great annoyance and, if he accidentally lost his passport, to serious trouble. Really dangerous men could often manage to get in by forged or borrowed passports or by the connivance of officials who were either corrupt or were in sympathy with plotters. Petrograd,

Moscow, and other leading cities swarmed with revolutionaries and foreign spies, and the frantic efforts of the police to deal with them often enmeshed the innocent as the guilty. One might have imagined that the Government would be glad to have undesirable persons get out. A story is told of a Russian official who said to a traveller: "You cannot stay in this country." "Very well," was the reply, "then I'll leave it." "Have you a passport to leave?" demanded the official. "No," was the response. "Then," said the official "you cannot leave. I will give you twenty-four hours to decide what you will do."

The real spirit of autocratic Russia was grimly manifested by the treatment of the Jews. This had long been characterized by deeds which outraged every feeling of justice and humanity. The Jews were subjected to unnecessary and cruel regulations, affecting their liberty, their rights of property, their places of residence, and even their treatment when ill. Prime Minister M. Stolypin forbade not only Government hospitals but private hospitals to receive Jewish patients and actually compelled them to dismiss those

whom they were already treating. There has been mob violence in other countries and Americans remember with shame attacks upon Negroes and Chinese in the United States; but the massacres of Jews in Russia were so extensive, so carefully planned, and so unmistakably connived at by the Government that they belong in a class of infamy by themselves. Mobs in other lands have usually been spasmodic local uprisings for which the governments concerned could be blamed only to the extent that local officials were negligent or incompetent; but there is unhappy reason for believing that high Russian authorities knew in advance of the systematic and formidable attacks that were to be made upon defenceless Jews, that in some instances they fomented the attacks, and that in others they deliberately refused to take preventive measures. Inoffensive men, women, and even children were butchered with a ruthlessness unparalled since the days of Nero. Not less than one hundred and twenty thousand Jews were driven out of the Empire in a single year. Only three per cent. of Jewish children were permitted to attend schools in the cities, five per cent. in the smaller towns, and not more

than ten per cent. in the Jewish settlements where the bulk of the population is Jewish, while graduates of Jewish high schools were not allowed to enter higher institutions.

Russian enmity towards the Jews went still farther and affected international relations. The first article of the Treaty of 1832 between Russia and the United States reads

"There shall be between the territories of the high contracting parties a reciprocal liberty of commerce and navigation. The inhabitants of their respective States shall mutually have liberty to enter the forts, places, and rivers of the territories of each party, wherever foreign commerce is permitted. They shall be at liberty to sojourn and reside in all parts whatsoever of said territories, in order to attend to their affairs, and they shall enjoy, to that effect, the same security and protection as natives of the country wherein they reside, on condition of their submitting to the laws and ordinances there prevailing, and particularly to the regulations in force concerning commerce."

The terms of this article are explicit and

make no exceptions on account of race or creed. They permit all Russians to be admitted to the United States and all Americans to be admitted to Russia. In the words of Justice Field of the United States Supreme Court: "It is a general principle of construction with respect to treaties that they shall be liberally construed, so as to carry out the apparent intention of the parties to secure equality and reciprocity between them. As they are contracts between independent nations, in their construction, words are to be taken in their ordinary meaning as understood in the public law of nations, and not in any artificial or special sense impressed upon them by local law, unless such restricted sense is clearly intended. And it has been held by this Court that where a treaty admits of two constructions, one restrictive of rights that may be claimed under it and the other favorable to them, the latter is to be preferred." [1]

But Russia persistently refused to accord to American citizens of Jewish birth the rights guaranteed by this Treaty. She could not plead that she discriminated only against Jews

[1] Case of Geofroy vs. Riggs, 133 U. S., 271.

who had obtained American citizenship for the purpose of returning to Russia and claiming immunities to which they would not otherwise have been entitled under Russian laws. The discrimination was applied to visiting Jews irrespective of former residence in Russia, including those who were descended from generations of American citizens. An American passport was not honoured if it was borne by an American citizen of Jewish descent. The Government of the United States repeatedly protested against this discrimination, but in vain. The indignities to which our Government was called upon to submit were so numerous, so long continued and so insulting that many Americans who were not of Jewish birth felt that patience had ceased to be a virtue. In November, 1911, the final act of humiliation took place when the President of the United States and the Secretary of State personally requested the Russian Legation in Washington to visé the passport of an American citizen of Jewish descent and high character who desired to make a short visit to his birth-place in Poland. The Russian Chargé d'Affaires courteously but firmly refused. The spectacle of their President as an unsuc-

cessful suppliant before a subordinate Russian official was not a pleasant one to the people of the United States, and they asked with increased irritation why their country should continue to be bound by a treaty which the other party repudiated in an essential part.

It is absurd to argue that zeal for Christ justifies the persecution of the people who slew Him. The spirit of the Man of Nazareth, who taught His disciples to pray for those who despitefully used them and who, even on the Cross, besought His Father to forgive His enemies, is at a far remove from the spirit which has butchered their innocent descendants.

Nor were the Jews the only sufferers under Russian oppression. What shall be said of the treatment of the Finns, who were deprived of cherished liberties which Russia had solemnly guaranteed to maintain? What about the Poles, whose national aspirations were crushed and who, even in Warsaw, their ancient capital, saw their streets patrolled by Russian police, all official positions held by Russians, and even the children in their schools taught by Russian teachers? What about the most intelligent and patriotic of Russians who lan-

guished in the fortress dungeons of Moscow and St. Petersburg, or spent their lives in the mines of bleakest Siberia? Verily, the tender mercies of autocratic Russia were cruel. No other nation, claiming to be civilized, had a government so brutal, so reactionary, and so corrupt.

II

ATTITUDE OF THE HOLY ORTHODOX CHURCH TOWARD CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

RELIGIOUS liberty was as alien as political liberty to Russian absolutism. The Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod, Pobyedonostseff, who was a power in Russia until his death a few years ago, although a man of ability and force, was notorious for narrowness and bigotry. His book, "Reflections of a Russian Statesman," abounds in statements which were not only characteristic of his administration but of the whole Russian idea of absolutism in politics and in religion. In a chapter on "The New Democracy" he wrote: "What is this freedom by which so many minds are agitated, which inspires so many insensate actions, so many wild speeches, which leads the people so often to misfortune? In the democratic sense of the word, freedom is the right of political

power, or, to express it otherwise, the right to participate in the government of the State. This universal aspiration for a share in government has no constant limitations and seeks no definite issue, but incessantly extends, so that we might apply to it the words of the ancient poet about dropsy: 'Crescit indulgens sibi.' . . . The history of mankind bears witness that the most necessary and fruitful reforms, the most durable measures, emanated from the supreme will of statesmen, or from a minority enlightened by lofty ideas and deep knowledge."

A chapter on "The Great Falsehood of Our Time" vouchsafes the following opinion: "Amongst the falsest of political principles is the principle of the sovereignty of the people. . . . Thence proceeds the theory of parliamentarism, which up to the present day had deluded much of the so-called intelligence and unhappily infatuated certain foolish Russians. It continues to maintain its hold on many minds with the obstinacy of a narrow fanaticism, although every day its falsehood is exposed more clearly to the world."

Another chapter deals with the press:

"From the day that man first fell, falsehood has ruled the world. . . . but never did the Father of lies spin such webs of falsehood of every kind as in this restless age. . . . Thus we are bidden to believe that the judgment of newspapers and periodicals, the judgment of the so-called press, is the expression of public opinion. This too is a falsehood. The press is one of the falsest institutions of our time."

Discussing the Church, he exclaimed: "How many men, how many institutions, have been perverted in the course of a false development! For these rooted principles in our religious institutions are, of all things, the most precious. May God prevent them from ever being destroyed by the untimely reformation of our Church."

It is not surprising that with such a man the virtual dictator of the religious policy of Russia, the conditions of life under the Inquisitor Torquemada in the fifteenth century were reproduced. February 26, 1903, the Tsar issued an edict proclaiming religious toleration; but those who fondly imagined that it meant the dawning of a new day in Russia were horrified only a few weeks later

by the frightful massacre of the Jews at Kishinyov.

The fact is that religious tolerance, as the Anglo-Saxon understands it, did not exist in Russia. Professor Gradovsky, of the Imperial University of St. Petersburg, said: "The full scope of freedom of conscience or religious faith embraces the following tests: (a) the freedom of public worship in accordance with the rites of one's creed; (b) the freedom of choosing a creed; (c) the freedom of preaching with the purpose of converting persons belonging to other denominations as well as of founding a new church; (d) the full enjoyment of political and civil rights by all persons regardless of church affiliation. The rules of religious tolerance, as expressed in the Russian law, are substantially confined to the freedom of worship." [1]

The course of events plainly showed that when officials talked about religious toleration, they used the term in the "Russian" sense. The ukase of the Empress Anne, February 2, 1835, makes the matter more intelligible to western readers, for it defines

[1] A. Gradovsky, "Elements of Russian Public Law," Vol. I, pp. 373, 376.

religious tolerance as merely freedom of worship but not the freedom of preaching for the purpose of making converts among Russian subjects, which is prohibited under severe penalties. "Heresies and schisms" were crimes. The meeting places of dissenters must not have the appearance of churches nor were they permitted to have crosses or bells. Children born outside of the pale of the Orthodox Church had indeed a limited degree of tolerance under the act of May 3, 1883; but the removal of civil and political disabilities guaranteed by that act did not apply to one who changed his faith. Section 190 of the Penal Code provided that if an apostate from the Orthodox Church brought up his children in his new faith, he was liable to imprisonment and "their children are entrusted to the care of relatives of the orthodox confession, or, in the absence of such, to the care of guardians likewise of the orthodox faith, who are appointed for the purpose by the Government."

That this law was enforced was mournfully illustrated by the case of so eminent a Russian as Prince Hilkoff, whose noble rank and relationship to a member of the Imperial

Cabinet did not save him from the trial of separation from his children. Stundists were prosecuted for singing hymns and offering prayers, in spite of an imperial ukase permitting them to do these things. "Officially it had not been received," was the reply when the ukase was pleaded in defence.

"Under the conditions of peasant life indeed," wrote Dr. Isaac A. Hourwich: "no dissenter can escape the charge of seeking to make converts among members of the Orthodox Church. The writer once witnessed the trial of a case which may be taken as typical. The prisoner himself was a Stundist but his son married an orthodox girl, and, as is customary among Russian peasants, took her into his father's house to live. At times the Stundists of the village would meet for the reading of the Bible at the old man's house. An average peasant house consists of a kitchen and one sitting room, so it was quite inevitable that the daughter-in-law should be present at the Stundist meetings. This was enough to make out a complete case of preaching an heretical doctrine to a member of the Orthodox Church. The old man was found guilty and sentenced to forfeiture of all civil

rights ("civil death") and banished to the Trans-Caucasian region." [1]

The concession drafted by M. Witte and granted by the Tsar at Easter, 1905, permitted a Russian to withdraw from the State Church and join another communion; but the Protestant clergyman who counselled him was liable to severe punishment for the crime of inducing or abetting a member of the Orthodox Church to leave its fold, while the convert himself might be thrown into a dungeon "to make sure of his appearance as a witness at the trial of the clergyman." Permission to transfer church membership in such circumstances was "like telling a man that he may travel from New York to Buffalo on condition that he does not pass through all the intermediate space." [2] Speaking of the one hundred thousand Baptists in Russia, the Rev. Dr. Henry C. Mabie of that communion told me, April 24, 1916, that every Baptist church in Russia had been closed by the Government, the pastors exiled to Siberia, and the members treated more intolerantly than ever.

[1] "The Case of Russia," pp. 379-380.
[2] E. J. Dillon, article on "Progress of the Russian Revolution," in "The American Monthly Review of Reviews," August, 1905.

What degree of religious liberty Russia would have granted other nations which she might succeed in dominating may be understood from Article III of her Treaty with Tibet, concluded in 1903:

"Entire liberty in what concerns Russian Orthodox as well as Lamaist worship will be introduced in Tibet; but all other religious doctrines will be absolutely prohibited. For this purpose the Grand Lama and the Superintendent of the Orthodox Peking Mission are bound to proceed amicably and by mutual consent, so as to guarantee the free propagation of both religions and take all necessary measures for avoiding religious disputes."

In other words, Russia proposed to forbid all religious teaching except that of the Russian Orthodox Church and the established religion of the country concerned. This could only mean that if Russia had won Korea, all the missionary work that had been built up by Protestants and Roman Catholics would have been destroyed and the missionaries expelled.

There were indeed some men and women of large sympathies and generous deeds in the

Holy Orthodox Church. It would be easy for any friend of Russia to cite conspicuous names, and there are multitudes of kind-hearted people in the country. But the Church as an establishment was reactionary and intolerant.

It was gorged with wealth. While hundreds of thousands of peasants were starving and famine relief funds were being raised in Great Britain and America, the domes of St. Isaac's Cathedral in St. Petersburg and of the Cathedral of the Holy Saviour in Moscow shone with a covering of pure gold, that on the former alone costing $250,000. A shrine of solid silver in the Monastery of St. Alexander Nevski weighs 3,250 pounds. Icons in hundreds of churches blaze with an almost incredible number of rubies, diamonds, and emeralds. A picture of the Virgin Mary in the Kazan Cathedral is set with jewels valued at $75,000, and the doors of the inner sanctuary are of sterling silver. The picture of the Virgin of Vladimir in the Cathedral of the Assumption in the Kremlin at Moscow is adorned with jewels conservatively estimated to be worth $225,000. Our guide told us $1,000,000. The visitor to Russian churches

is amazed by the lavishness and gorgeousness of display on every hand—mosaic floors, walls of agate and jasper, shrines of solid silver or of copper heavily overlaid with beaten gold, stately columns of malachite, each of the eight Corinthian pillars in St. Isaac's Cathedral, the gift of Prince Demidoff, costing $200,000, mitres and croziers studded with precious stones, and priestly vestments stiff with cloth of gold and profusely embroidered with pearls. And as one leaves this splendour, he is greeted at the door by scores of beggars—feeble old women holding out trembling hands, and pitifully wan children shivering in rags and emaciated with hunger; while in hundreds of country districts whole families are dying of starvation. There are costly churches in other countries, but I know of none which have such enormous wealth in a form which could be so easily converted into food without impairing the usefulness of the buildings for religious worship.

And yet there is something about the worship of the Russian churches which deeply impresses the traveller. The typical edifice is large, of a semi-Oriental type of architecture, with an excess of colour and ornamentation

that is only saved from the bizarre by the harmonious blending of shades and the atmosphere of solemnity which pervades the spacious interior. The priests are, as a rule, imperfectly educated, poorly paid, narrow in their outlook, and rigid in their conviction that the Holy Orthodox Church is the sole repository of truth. It is a curious fact that while the Russian people venerate their Church, they do not hold their priests in corresponding regard. But one finds himself drawn to those priests. Bigoted and intolerant though they are, they uncomplainingly pass their lives in poverty for the sake of the Church they love. Men of large stature are common, and all believe that they imitate the example of our Lord in allowing hair and beard to grow untrimmed. These tall priests, with their long, heavy beards and hair falling about their shoulders, are men of venerable aspect. The village priest is the father of the humble people about him and devotes himself to them with single-hearted zeal. There are indeed priests of a different type, selfish, suspicious, and greedy; but there are thousands whose lives are marked by simplicity of faith and unselfishness of service.

The typical congregation, too, worships with a reverence and devotion which might well shame some western congregations. There are none of the laughing and talking before and after the service, none of the smiling and whispering during the singing of hymns, which so painfully characterize restless and talkative Americans. The Russian quietly and reverently enters his church, patiently stands through a service whose length is often protracted to two or three hours, and though he may not understand every part of the elaborate ritual, he gives it his unwavering attention.

And what shall I say of the music of a Russian cathedral? There is no organ and there are no female voices. The chorus choirs are composed of men carefully trained through a long series of years. The Russians have naturally rich, sonorous voices, and their sacred music is inexpressibly moving. At times soft and appealing, at others a weird minor strain, it not infrequently swells into a volume of almost overpowering majesty. I have heard church music in many parts of the world, but such music nowhere else. It voices the sadness and suffering, the implicit

faith and the solemn mission of a great people. More truly than any other church music in the world, it is the expression of the deeper soul of a nation, elemental in its moods of storm and tenderness, of half-barbarous passion and of sublime aspiration. Every time we heard it, we stood in silence and awe, conscious that the strings of our hearts were being strangely swept and feeling as if we were in wide spaces under the open sky and in the presence of a mountain Sinai from which issued alternately the crashing thunder, the blazing lightning, and then the murmuring of trees and brooks and the still, small Voice. Was this mere emotionalism? It may have been, but the mysterious spell still lingers in my memory.

The religiousness of the Russian peasant, tinged as it undoubtedly is with superstition, sometimes manifests itself in a pathetic longing for a purer faith. A stray and unmarked newspaper clipping brings a curiously touching story. Three Cossacks of the Ural returned to their homes in the town of Uralsk after an absence of nearly four years. They had held to a tradition that, centuries ago, when doctrine and ritual in Russia were more

pure than now, a number of Russian pilgrims started for the East and established the "Empire of the White Waters" in which alone could be found pure dogma and the ancient unpolluted ritual. Some years ago, a mysterious individual, clad as a monk, appeared among the Cossacks. He gave himself out as Bishop Arkadin from the "Empire of the White Waters," collected a goodly sum from the simple peasants, and did much to create fresh interest for the "Empire." When he suddenly disappeared, the Cossacks met in council and appointed three of their hetmans to search for the "Empire of the White Waters." A subscription list was opened and three hundred pounds were collected to defray their expenses. Speaking no language but their own, the hetmans made their toilsome way to Odessa, and from there to Constantinople, Egypt, and Palestine, making inquiry about the "Empire" as they proceeded; but no one had heard of it, not even the Patriarchs in Alexandria and Jerusalem. They passed through the Suez Canal, and in Ceylon they heard about strange sects in the interior, Theosophists, Buddhists, and Brahmins; but closer inquiry showed them that these bodies

did not belong to the "Empire of the White Waters." They proceeded to Singapore and Hong-kong, and were jeered at by Christians and heathen alike. From their steamer at Saigon, they heard the sound of church bells, and hastening on shore, they wept tears of disappointment to find that the bells were those of the Roman Catholic Cathedral.

Perhaps in Japan they might hear something. On their way thither, they touched at Shanghai and saw the Yang-tzse rolling its whitish-yellowish flood to the sea. They sang the old Slavonic Te Deum, for this was surely the river that flowed through the "Empire of the White Waters." But the Russian priest laughed at them. It was the same in Japan, the same everywhere. Broken in health, with empty purses and wholly dispirited, they arrived at Vladivostok, and began their homeward journey across the six thousand miles of Siberia. Much of the way they walked, though kindly people here and there helped them and good-natured captains of river steamboats gave them an occasional lift. At last, after four years of absence, they arrived home, aged, worn, heart-sore, to tell their neighbors that there was no "Empire of the

White Waters" in all the East. "Perhaps it is in the West," they said. "But don't send us. We are too tired."

Unfortunately, the religiousness of the Russian has less relation to conduct than that of the Briton or American, who seldom unites devotion and disregard of moral restraints. It is true that "the instinct of religious reverence is strong in all classes. On feast days, the churches in town and country are full of men and women. The services never seem to lose their atmosphere of pious awe. The genuflexions of the congregation, vigorous and even violent as they sometimes are, at least do not shock the sense as being mechanical or insincere. . . . But the beliefs of the lower monks are formal and unintelligent, and the peasant is even more ignorant. His mind is often full of a whole host of non-Christian superstitions, of native poetic traditions, glen and wood and water fairies, and curious prejudices as to 'luck.' 'Luck' is more often than not 'bad luck.' Religion is much too seldom applied to life. A great awe seizes the worshipper in the church, but it is no guarantee even against crime. It is not that he is insincere; it is because his wor-

ship is an emotion. It was put to me that with us reason stands in the foreground, but with them, feeling; and this generalization, which applies to all classes, helps to explain much that is Russian besides the religion." [1]

We must give the Russia of the Tsar credit for the prohibition of the sale and use of liquor as a beverage. This was done as a war measure in order to increase the efficiency of the army and the nation in the terrific struggle against Germany and Austria. The results were so notably satisfactory as to command the support of public sentiment, and hope is general that the prohibition will be permanent. The Russians were not moderate in their potations. They drank like the North American Indians and the African Negroes—intemperately and of the fiery distilled vodka. Sundays and festival days were characterized by the wildest orgies in innumerable villages as well as in all the cities. The ordinarily sluggish peasant becomes a good deal of a brute when drunk, and acts of violence and bestiality were common. The drink bill of the nation was enormous, and much of the

[1] Barnard Pares, "Russia and Reform," pp. 149-150.

general poverty was due to the squandering of money on liquor.

Prohibition brought immediate improvement. Fights and murders diminished. Sundays and festival days became times of healthful sobriety and religious observances. More money was spent for the necessaries and conveniences of life and to the betterment of legitimate business. The families of peasant farmers ate their eggs and chickens and butter instead of selling them to buy vodka, and workmen and soldiers were far more reliable and efficient than when they went on weekly or nightly sprees. Alcohol is still manufactured in as great quantities as ever, but it is used for industrial purposes or exported to France for the manufacture of explosives. There is some illicit selling for beverage purposes, but so furtively and on such a small scale that a recent traveller, who spent four months in Russia, reports that the only drunken men he saw were in Archangel, where they had managed to get whiskey from British ships in the harbour. Broadly speaking, "Russia is without spirits, beer, or wine." [1]

One wishes that he could add that other

[1] Stephen Graham in "Russia in 1916," p. 132.

vices were diminished in like proportion. Unfortunately, intemperance is not the only sin, and its abolition does not usher in the millennium. Mohammedan lands are temperate, but they are not models of good conduct. It is a great gain to throttle one such vice as intemperance, but the other foes of morality remain to be fought. The licentiousness of Russian society has long been notorious. Immorality is so sadly common even in the most enlightened western nations that one must be humble in criticising another people for it. But Russia claims to be the most orthodox and thoroughly religious of all Christian countries. When therefore we read Tolstoy's descriptions of licentiousness in Russian society, and George Kennan's statement that there are fifty thousand registered prostitutes in Petrograd, besides large numbers of clandestine ones, we cannot make the allowances which we must make for some Asiatic countries where, until recently, there was no powerful church with a knowledge of the Christian teaching regarding purity in thought and act. We cannot justly hold a church primarily responsible for the existence of every evil in society; but we are surely justi-

fied in regarding the moral conditions which prevailed in Russia as a reflection upon the character of the Church which claimed such extensive powers. The Holy Orthodox Church brought severer punishment upon heretics than upon adulterers.

Two years after the prohibition of the sale and use of liquor as a beverage, Stephen Graham, whose friendship for the Russians will not be challenged, sorrowfully wrote: "The suppression of vodka is good, but it would be absurd to say that the energies unleashed are entirely on the side of good. The old Adam can express itself in many ways. The wrong impulse merely prevented is not excised; it breaks out in another place. There is more gambling, more unrestrained sexual sin. I suppose no Tsar's ukase could clean up the Nevsky Prospect or Tverskaya, or stop love affairs with other men's wives. . . . The spirit of England would not tolerate a Kislovodsk; we have nothing quite so shameless during the war. . . . The Russian boy of the town is born into a world of more temptations and risks than the English boy. A great deal of disclosed Russian genius must be poisoned between the ages of twelve and

twenty by certain social conditions which no one in Russia seems capable of making an effort to clear up. The Russian town of today is no doubt none too easy for the young woman, and it seems a sort of hell for the young man, a long burning and the worm which dieth not." [1]

And so the fight for righteousness is not ended when one enemy is subdued. But the moral forces of society may be justly encouraged by their great though partial victory, and should gird themselves with fresh zeal and courage for the encounter with remaining evils.

Taking the Russia of the Tsars as a whole, while one could find much to interest and even to charm, nevertheless it was painfully clear that the Government and the bureaucratic and ecclesiastical officials who supported it were an incubus upon a great people, a survival of a form of administration and an attitude toward other nations which were of ominous import for the world. British opinion found bitter expression in innumerable books, pamphlets, newspapers, parliamentary speeches, and in Kipling's poem "The Truce

[1] "Russia in 1916," pp. 121, 136, 140.

of the Bear," in which he represented Russia as an animal:

"Horrible, hairy, human, with paws like hands in prayer,

. . . . . .

". . . this is the time to fear,
When he stands up like a tired man, tottering near and near;
When he stands up as pleading, in wavering, man-brute guise,
When he veils the hate and cunning of the little swinish eyes."

In America, even the gentle spirit of Whittier was moved to write:

"Fell spider of the North,
Stretching thy great feelers forth;
Within whose web the freedom dies
Of nations swallowed up as flies."

III

RISE OF THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

EVERY lover of liberty in other lands sympathized with the tremendous struggle which many Russian people made to secure for their country a more enlightened rule. The mighty forces of the modern world, which had long been operating in western Europe and in America, could not be kept out of Russia. The reactionary autocracy tried to keep them out, at first with contemptuous confidence and then with frantic fear. But slowly and surely ideas of justice and liberty began to seep under and through the barriers which separated Russia from the rest of the world and to beget impatience of oppression and the passion for civil, intellectual and religious freedom. It should seem as if men everywhere would have learned from scores of historical precedents that, when a governing class attempts to repress the minds of men and to crush their aspirations

by sheer brute force, the day of retribution is sure to come. The autocracy could succeed for a time in throwing patriots into the dungeons of Russia or exiling them to the mines of Siberia; the secret police could make the lives of millions a constant terror; the knout of the jailer and the sabre of the Cossack could inflict appalling barbarities; but the rise of a free spirit in a great nation could no more be permanently checked than the current of a Niagara. It was simply impossible for the Russian people permanently to acquiesce in the kind of governmental conditions which had existed for weary centuries. They are intensely loyal to their native land. Their temperament induces them to long patience. They are attached to their Church with blind devotion and they fondly called the Tsar "Little Father." But there are limits to what even the most patient of men can endure. Their struggle against oppression, injustice, and almost unbelievable cruelty was one of the most sublime struggles which the world has witnessed. Men and women alike—and women perhaps even more than men—manifested a courage, determination, and self-sacrifice which make mere praise seem inade-

quate and cheap. They suffered in the cause of liberty what the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews said that the early Christians suffered for their faith; they were "tortured," they had "trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonment; they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, slain with the sword; they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented." And of them as of the Christians of old, we, who peacefully enjoyed the blessings of liberty in other lands, could say with mingled humility and reverence: "Of whom the world was not worthy."

The Revolution was slow in ripening. It began with a few daring spirits in the early years of the nineteenth century, although an occasional voice of protest had been heard before that in the wilderness of despotism. Gradually the voices grew in number and in persistence. The Government tried to stifle them. Swarming spies and secret police sought out the reformers, and soon the prisons were filled and pathetic processions trod the weary way to Siberian exile. But the demand for freedom was not quelled. Pres-

ently indignation became strong enough to manifest itself in sporadic uprisings. It is interesting to note that every foreign war for a century was followed by revolutionary outbreaks, each more formidable than its predecessors. This was doubtless due, in part at least, to the fact that the corruption and inefficiency of the bureaucrats were most conspicuous at such times, involving the country in famine and epidemic at home and in defeat and humiliation abroad. Even when the wars were popular, the people resented the gross malfeasance and mismanagement of the officials and the resultant distress and ruin.

For a long time, the comparative isolation of Russia and the absence of a free press prevented other nations from knowing of the growing aspirations of the people and of the ruthless barbarity with which the autocracy sought to crush them. Then, in 1885 and 1886, George Kennan began to publish the results of his investigations in the prisons of Russia and the barracks and mines of Siberia. The world was astounded and horrified by the revelations of almost incredible atrocities. The Russian censors tried to prevent Kennan's writings from entering the country; but they

could not keep them from the peoples of western Europe and America. A few copies of the articles were smuggled across the frontier and stealthily passed from hand to hand. The atrocities were continued, but the sorely persecuted revolutionists were greatly cheered by the knowledge that at last the world knew the facts, and they devoted themselves with renewed zeal to their propaganda. The revolutionary party included men and women of all classes—lawyers, writers, physicians, university professors and students and common people. Educated men and women preponderated—Russia's very best. A few of the officers and soldiers in the army were also sympathetic. Their number was considerably increased during the Russia-Japan War. George Kennan, who was then in Japan as a war correspondent, obtained permission from the Japanese Government to distribute revolutionary literature among the tens of thousands of Russian prisoners in Japan. Friends in New York responded generously to his appeal for funds, and the Russian soldiers were liberally supplied with reading in their own language. Thus, said Kennan, fifty thousand seeds of revolution were sowed in the army;

for, of course, these troops were sent back to Russia after the treaty of peace, carrying the revolutionary ideas with them to be cautiously disseminated among their comrades.

A better day for Russia was anticipated when Nicholas II ascended the throne; but hopes were disappointed when, January 29, 1895, in reply to an address by a deputation representing the Zemstvos he said: "I know that in some of the assemblies of the Zemstvos voices have made themselves heard in a sense which indicates the desire and ambition to realize idle dreams, inasmuch as there are people who think that the Zemstvos may be permitted to take part in affairs of State. Let every man know that I dedicate all my strength to the welfare of our beloved Russia, but that I am also filled with an equally strong determination, as was my never-to-be-forgotten father before me, to maintain the Autocracy unbending and unchanged."

The growth of the revolutionary movement, the unpopularity of the war with Japan, the mortification of defeat, and the disclosure of the shameless swindling and scheming which characterized the Government's conduct of the war, precipitated the Revolution of 1905. It

looked serious for a time. Over five millions of people were involved. The Government succeeded in subduing it, but forty thousand persons were killed and a hundred thousand more were exiled to Siberia.

Again was the saying illustrated that truth crushed to earth will rise again. The revolutionary party had been given national prominence. Multitudes of Russians had been profoundly impressed by the character and intelligence of its leaders and by the justice of their cause, and they resented the frightful brutality with which their friends and neighbours had been treated. The result was that a hundred sympathizers were gained for the revolutionists for every one that was executed or banished.

Suddenly the world was rejoiced by the news that, on October 30, 1905, the Tsar had signed the following decree:

"We, Nicholas II, by the grace of God, Emperor, and Autocrat of all the Russias, Grand Duke of Finland, etc., declare to all our faithful subjects that the troubles and agitations in our capitals and in numerous other places fill our heart with excessive pain

and sorrow. . . . We, therefore, direct our Government to carry out our inflexible will in the following manner:

"First—To extend to the population the immutable foundations of civic liberty, based on the real inviolability of person, freedom of conscience, speech, union, and association.

"Second—Without suspending the already ordered elections to the State Duma, to invite to participation in the Duma, so far as the limited time before the convocation of the Duma will permit, those classes of the population now completely deprived of electoral rights, leaving the ultimate development of the principle of the electoral right in general to the newly established legislative order of things.

"Third—To establish as an unchangeable rule that no law shall be enforceable without the approval of the State Duma, and that it shall be possible for the elected of the people to exercise real participation in the supervision of the legality of the acts of the authorities appointed by us."

This decree was hailed by the press of Europe and America as a "historic document,"

"the Tsar's charter of liberty to one-tenth of the human race." "The people have won the day, the Emperor has surrendered, the autocracy has ceased to exist," ran a jubilant despatch from St. Petersburg to the London Times and the New York Times. The first Russian Parliament convened amid impressive ceremonies in the famous Winter Palace, St. Petersburg, May 10, 1906. The Emperor stood in person before the assembled members and a throng of gorgeously arrayed officials and courtiers, and read the following address from the Throne:

"The Supreme Providence which gave me the care of our Fatherland moved me to call to my assistance in legislative work elected representatives of the people. In the expectation of a brilliant future for Russia, I greet in your persons the best men from the Empire, whom I ordered my beloved subjects to choose from among themselves. A difficult work lies before you. I trust that love for your Fatherland and your earnest desire to serve it will inspire and unite you. I shall keep inviolate the institutions which I have granted, with the firm assurance that you will

devote all your strength to the services of your country and especially to the needs of the peasantry, which are so close to my heart, and to the education of the people and their economical welfare, remembering that to the dignity and prosperity of the State not only freedom but order founded upon justice is necessary. I desire from my heart to see my people happy and hand down to my son an Empire secure, well-organized and enlightened. May God bless the work that lies before me in unity with the Council of the Empire and the Imperial Duma! May this day be the day of the moral revival of Russia and the day for the renewal of its highest forces! Approach with solemnity the labours for which I call you, and be worthy of the responsibilities put upon you by the Emperor and the people. May God assist us!"

The Tsar was undoubtedly sincere, for he was an amiable and well-meaning man, who in private life would probably have made a creditable record as a good citizen. But while he was theoretically the source of absolute power, practically he was hedged about by a palace clique which permitted him to

know only what it wished him to know, which did thousands of things in his name of which he never heard, and which persuaded him, often by false pretences, to sanction many acts from which his kindly impulses would have shrunk if he had realized all that they involved. He was only nominally the ruler of Russia, acting as a figure-head at public functions, signing documents which he did not read, and enjoying his books and the companionship of his wife and children while the Government was conducted by resolute and unscrupulous men who firmly believed that the old autocratic régime must be preserved at all hazards. The Tsar's personal weakness was well known to many of his people and the worst things in his reign were not attributed to him so much as to the evil men about him. The decree and address illustrated the ebulitions of liberal feeling to which he was fitfully subject; but the bureaucrats took care to see that no "harm" was done.

At any rate the atrocities which followed the Tsar's high-sounding proclamation, gave ghastly proof of how little the new Constitution really meant. It is not unfair to interpret this reform edict by the conduct of the

men who were kept in or appointed to public offices which enabled them to give effect to the promises of the Imperial decree. They were Russia's most ruthless reactionaries. They crowded the prisons, kept the executioners busy, and lengthened the weary processions to bleakest Siberia. Is it any wonder that the revolutionists became desperate? Strongly as every civilized man must abhor assassination as a political weapon, no intelligent person could have any pity for such tyrants as General Tropoff, who escaped death July 14, 1906, only because General Kozloff was mistaken for him; General Min, who was shot at Peterhof, August 26, 1906; General Wonlarlarski, Governor-General of Warsaw, shot August 27, 1906; General Nicolaieff, assassinated by five revolutionists at Warsaw, September 19, 1906; General Rinkevich, killed at Askabad, October 1, 1906; Count Alexis Ignatieff, shot at Tver, December 22, 1906; Major-General Launitz, Prefect of the St. Petersburg police, shot January 3, 1907; Prince Lizhavakoff, killed in Trans-Caucasia, May 19, 1909, and Premier P. C. Stolypin, shot in the Royal Theatre, September 14, 1911. The careers of these officials were

characterized by indescribable ferocity and, in the case of the last, by so many hangings, that the phrase "Stolypin's neckties" became a grim by-word throughout the Empire.

In 1913 a number of humane and high-minded men in Great Britain secured signatures to a public protest against the ill-treatment of Russian political prisoners and an "appeal to the conscience of humanity against the torture and destruction of many thousand human lives." They characterized the conditions as "more revolting" than those which Kennan had described a quarter of a century before and which had aroused a storm of resentment in western Europe. The protest stated that since the Tsar's manifesto of October, 1905, promising liberty to the people of Russia, over forty thousand persons had been sentenced for political offences. Of these over three thousand were executed, and more than ten thousand thrown into the horrible Katorga (hard labour) prison.

"Imprisonment has become an endless torture," the protest continued. "The prisons are overcrowded to such an extent that it is impossible for the prisoners to find rest even on the bare floor; absolute starvation and most

barbarous treatment have made the prisons a perfect hell. Ten kopeks (2½d.) is the daily allowance for a prisoner's food, but a great part of it is pocketed by the various officials.

"Packed in overcrowded rooms, which are devoid of the simplest hygienic equipment and cleanliness, the underfed prisoners are almost deprived of any medical assistance and become the victims of all kinds of epidemics. Those sentenced to long terms of imprisonment, chiefly politicians, are in actual fact condemned to a cruel form of slow death. The personal treatment of the political prisoners is described as 'extremely horrible.'

"An epidemic of suicide has developed amongst the prisoners, who see in death the only way of escape. Most tragic is the fate of those tens of thousands of political exiles, of whom most are deported to Siberia without trial, but simply by the arbitrary action of the administration. Most of them are sent to a frozen waste, where, unable to obtain the necessary food, clothing, and housing, they perish."

Among the hundreds who signed this document were such Englishmen as Lord Lytton,

Josiah C. Wedgwood, M.P., Ramsey MacDonald, M.P., Joseph Pointer, M.P., Sir A. Conan Doyle, H. G. Wells, Jerome K. Jerome, Professor J. B. Bury (Cambridge), Professor Gilbert Murray (Oxford), Maurice Hewlett, and Laurence Irving. Their indictment was terrific, but it was amply justified by the tragic and incontrovertible facts.

IV

CULMINATION OF THE REVOLUTION

IT is not surprising that when the European War broke out in 1914, many, like the writer, whose natural sympathies were strongly with the British and French and Belgians, felt obliged to take a neutral position, not because they favoured the governmental organization and methods of Germany and Austria, but because they felt that autocratic Russia was worse than militaristic Germany and that a decisive victory of the Allies would enthrone Russia as the dominant power on the continent of Europe, the Near East and the Far East and thus make it the supreme power of the world. That the British Government was not unmindful of the incongruity of an alliance with the government of the Tsar for freedom and democracy was frankly admitted by the Hon. David Lloyd-George, Prime Minister of Great Britain, when he said: "There were many of us whose hearts were filled with gloomy anxiety when

we contemplated all the prospects of a great peace conference summoned to settle the future of democracy with one of the most powerful partners at that table the most reactionary autocracy in the world." [1]

This fear was strengthened as the war continued. At first, indeed, friends in Great Britain and America had large hope that a new spirit of liberty and progress would prevail in Russia; but the autocracy was still in absolute control, and the persecution of the Jews went on as ferociously as ever in spite of the valour with which thousands of them fought for Russia on many a bloody battlefield.[2] The revolutionary spirit had been rapidly gaining headway when the war broke out, and the autocracy now seized the opportunity to strengthen its hold upon every department of the Government and to cry treason when any protest was made. With contemptuous disregard of popular feeling, it made the reactionary bureaucrat, Boris Stürmer, Premier, and the equally feared A. D. Protopopov, Minister of the Interior. The Ministry of Justice and other posts were filled by

[1] Address, June 29, 1917.
[2] Compare the sorrowful accounts in the New York Times of October 29, 1916, and other issues.

men of the same ilk. The comparatively enlightened Minister of Foreign Affairs, Sazonoff, was dismissed and Stürmer added that portfolio to his own in order to gather all possible power into his hands. When Protopopov was asked to explain his proposed programme, he haughtily replied that "to talk of programmes in these days is to indulge in phraseology."

The autocratic Cabinet even deemed itself strong enough to hamper the All-Russian Zemstvo Union and the All-Russian Municipalities Union. The Zemstvos in particular had a strong hold upon popular feeling, with local, district, and national organizations, which were a combination of a community welfare society, a forum for discussion of special problems, and a benevolent society. These Zemstvos and the Municipalities Union were popular organizations which were actively helping the Ministry of War in securing support and equipment for the army, making clothing for the soldiers, caring for the wounded and for refugees, and enlisting the services of women and civilian labourers in various other forms of co-operative effort for the common welfare. Imagine the feelings of

the people when the Government, in the spring of 1916, issued an order prohibiting national conferences and conventions of all social organizations on the ground that they were revolutionary in tendency! Respectful protests brought no relief but on the contrary a still more stringent order directing that every meeting of every kind and for any purpose, whether executive, local, or special, must be attended by a representative of the police who was given power to close the meeting at his discretion.

Meantime, matters were going badly for Russia both at home and in the field. The armies were being defeated. The loss of Poland and its recognition by Germany as an independent kingdom were regarded by the Russian people as due to the incompetence of their Government. The rumour began to gain credence that the bureaucrats were secretly willing to see Russia defeated. Famine conditions capped the climax of disaster. Prices rose to prohibitive heights. Starving men grow desperate, especially when they believe that there are ample supplies of food which officials are manipulating for personal profit. Although the single Province of

Viatka had a surplus of 50,000,000 bushels of grain of which only 5,000,000 were requisitioned for the army, the Province was forbidden to export the remaining 45,000,000 bushels to relieve the scarcity and lower the prices in other provinces.

The rage of the people deepened. Did the arrogant bureaucrats see it? They did not. They never do. But the Constitutional Democrats did, and they quickly took advantage of an issue on which they could safely make an attack on "The System." Shortly after the opening of the Duma, November 14, 1916, they moved to the attack under the leadership of Professor Paul N. Milyukoff. They so sharply criticised the high officials for maladministration of the war, corrupt handling of supplies, and alleged sympathy with Germany that the Government deemed it prudent to conciliate them, and to substitute the more moderate M. Alexander Trepoff for the reactionary Boris Stürmer as Premier and Minister of Foreign Affairs. They well knew that there was dynamite in the charge that their greed and graft were crippling the armies in the field and that they were in secret correspondence with the enemy regarding the de-

sertion of their Allies and the making of a separate peace. Such suspicions were inflammable, and Milyukoff availed himself of them in a sensational speech. The Government did not care to punish a man who in a time of crisis appealed to patriotism and the national duty to soldiers; but it forbade the publication of the speech so that the fire could not spread among the people.

It was an encouraging sign that the spirit of reform had become strong enough to voice such a protest. But within two months, the reactionary party had regained the ascendancy, brought about the downfall of Trepoff and his Cabinet, made the autocratic Prince Golitzive Premier, dismissed the progressive Minister of War, General Shuvaieff, who had been one of the active instruments in overthrowing the Stürmer régime, and put in his place a bitter reactionary, General M. A. Beliaeff. The new Premier at once justified the fears with which he was regarded by publicly announcing that he considered himself and his Cabinet as responsible not to the Duma but solely to the Emperor, that his watchword was "everything for the war," and that "being occupied with this aim we

cannot now think of internal reforms." To make matters worse, if that were possible, a monk, Rasputine, a man of remarkable physical stature and beauty, of unbounded ambition, of almost hypnotic magnetism, but of profligate character and medieval fanaticism, had gained a baleful ascendancy over the weak Tsar and many others in the court circles, particularly among the women. There was little hope of improved governmental conditions as long as he was the real power behind the throne and able at any time to induce his imperial master to do almost anything he might choose. But, as in the case of Cardinal Wolsey, his arrogance brought about his ruin. Unlike Wolsey, he did not lose the favour of his Sovereign, but his enemies assassinated him early in the year 1917.

Evidently something more radical was needed than changes in the personnel of a few high officials. Complete reconstruction of the system of Government was required. Nothing short of a revolution was necessary to extricate Russia from the clutches of her corrupt and reactionary autocracy. There was reason to fear that when it came it would be as bloody as the French Revolution. The at-

titude of the bureaucrats was virtually the same as that of the court and aristocracy of France prior to the cataclysm of 1789. The few reforms were sullenly conceded of necessity by an autocracy which had learned nothing from the growth of modern ideas and popular unrest. It was painfully significant that in November, 1916, the League of Foreign Nations of Russia, organized in Sweden by members of various non-Russian races, addressed the following telegram to Premier Asquith of Great Britain:

"The sympathy you have shown in your last speech for the suffering Armenians has aroused a lively echo in our hearts as further proof that the rights and liberties of small nations are acknowledged. The fate of our fellow-people affects us. We beg you, however, not to forget that the foreign nations of Russia have borne and must still bear incomparably heavier sufferings. Many millions of Finns, Lithuanians, White Russians, Poles, Jews, Ukrainians, Georgians, Caucasians, Tartars, and peoples of Central Asia, by order of the Russian Government have been evicted, starved, looted, and murdered. Our national

civilization and our religion are persecuted and suppressed, since we are under Russian domination. Your sense of justice cannot admit that sufferings which are far greater than those of the Armenians shall be forgotten and remain unconsidered. News about this condition seldom is made public. Only a little has become known about our sufferings; otherwise you could not have omitted to mention us. We remind you of 97,000,000 members of the foreign nations in Russia who have to bear awful sufferings and ardently long for the re-establishment of human rights.

MICHAEL LEMPICKIE, President.
BARON ROPP, Secretary."

While the European War dragged its weary length, with no signs of ending except those which each side interpreted favourably to itself, the revolutionary movement suddenly culminated in March, 1917, in an overturning so startling, so colossal, so far-reaching in its probable effect, not only upon Russia but upon the future of the human race, that it overshadowed every other event. The Duma had manifested increasing restiveness under the arbitrary and corrupt course of the Govern-

ment. The stupid Tsar and his reactionary advisers blindly imagined that the old arbitrary methods would again work, and the Tsar signed an order dissolving the Duma for its presumption in daring to meddle with matters which belonged to the Throne and the Cabinet. But the day for abject obedience had passed. The Duma refused to dissolve. This was going too far to stop. The leaders of the Duma well knew that Siberia or death awaited them unless they carried their defiance to a successful issue. They had counted the cost and did not hesitate. They deposed and imprisoned the bureaucratic officials, and issued a manifesto in which they stated that they had found it necessary to take the reins of government into their own hands. The police of Petrograd attempted resistance but were quickly overpowered by the people who thronged the streets. The troops in the capital supported the Duma. The Tsar, hurrying back from the headquarters of the army in the field, was met at Pskov by representatives of the Duma who compelled him to sign the following decree of abdication March 15, which was thoughtfully drafted for him so that he would be sure to say what was wanted:

"We, Nicholas II, by the Grace of God, Emperor of all the Russias, Tsar of Poland, and Grand Duke of Finland, etc., make known to all our faithful subjects: In the day of the great struggle against a foreign foe, who has been striving for three years to enslave our country, God has wished to send to Russia a new and painful trial. Interior troubles threaten to have a fatal repercussion on the final outcome of the war. The destinies of Russia and the honour of our dear Fatherland require that the war be prosecuted at all cost to a victorious end. The cruel enemy is making his last effort and the moment is near when our valiant army, in concert with those of our glorious allies, will definitely chastise the foe. In these decisive days in the life of Russia, we believe our people should have the closest union and organization of all their forces for the realization of speedy victory. For this reason, in accord with the Duma of the Empire, we have considered it desirable to abdicate the throne of Russia and lay aside our supreme power. Not wishing to be separated from our loved son, we leave our heritage to our brother, the Grand Duke Michael Alexandrovitch, blessing his advent to the

throne of Russia. We hand over the Government to our brother in full union with the representatives of the nation who are seated in the legislative chambers, taking this step with an inviolable oath in the name of our well-beloved country. We call on all faithful sons of the Fatherland to fulfil their sacred patriotic duty in this painful moment of national trial, and to aid our brother and the representatives of the nation in bringing Russia into the path of prosperity and glory. May God aid Russia."

Grand Duke Michael, who had formerly incurred the imperial wrath by a scandal which resulted in a morganatic marriage with a beautiful divorced woman with whom he had fallen in love, but who was more popular than his elder brother, made a virtue of necessity by replying March 16:

"This heavy responsibility has come to me at the voluntary request of my brother, who has transferred the imperial Throne to me during a period of warfare which is accompanied with unprecedented popular disturbances. Moved by the thought which is in the

minds of the entire people that the good of the country is paramount, I have adopted the firm resolution to accept the supreme power only if this be the will of our great people, who by the plebiscite organized by their representatives in a constituent assembly shall establish a form of government and new fundamental laws for the Russian State. Consequently, invoking the benediction of our Lord, I urge all citizens of Russia to submit to the Provisional Government established upon the initiative of the Duma and invested with full plenary powers until such time, which will follow with as little delay as possible, as the constituent assembly, on a basis of universal, direct, equal, and secret suffrage, shall by its decision as to the new form of government express the will of the people."

It promptly appeared, however, that while the Duma deemed it expedient to legalize the new Government by temporarily recognizing the hereditary succession to the throne, it was disposed to keep the real power in its own hands. The newly created Regent was not permitted to exercise any authority and soon dropped out of the Government altogether.

Russia's greatest general, the Grand Duke Nicholas, under whom the army had done its hardest fighting but whom the Tsar had deprived of the supreme command and transferred to the army operating against the Turks, was now restored to his former position as Commander-in-Chief. But his day, too, was short, and he was sent into retirement on his private estate in the Crimea.

The revolutionists did not propose to put the new Government into the hands of the Tsar's relatives and they soon eliminated every member of the old régime, confiscated the vast wealth of the Crown and tore down the imperial emblems in public buildings.

All this was accomplished with amazingly small loss of life. There was some fighting in a number of cities; but five days after the Revolution had triumphed, only four thousand persons were reported as killed and seven thousand wounded, an infinitesimal number for a victorious revolution in so vast a nation. The autocratic system, so long deemed impregnable, had apparently collapsed at a touch like a house of cards.

The fallen Tsar was made a prisoner in his summer palace. Common soldiers kept him

within the prescribed bounds and officers of low degree received his pathetic requests. His weak nature did not maintain the haughty dignity that might have been expected of a kingly soul, and he sobbed like a child as he paced his room and the adjoining garden. He was incapable of making any serious effort to regain his Throne; but his presence so near the capital was deemed inexpedient by the Provisional Government, and he was conveyed during the summer to Tobolsk, Siberia. Never was the irony of retributive justice more caustically displayed. No longer was he the proud "Nicholas II, by the Grace of God Emperor of all the Russias," but plain "Mr. Romanoff," an exile to a lonely city three hundred miles north of the Trans-Siberian Railway in a region to which he had banished multitudes of his former subjects.

V

DIFFICULTIES OF A SUDDENLY LIBERATED PEOPLE

THE whole civilized world is viewing the present situation in Russia with mingled eagerness and anxiety. A period of turbulence is to be expected. The first exercise of unaccustomed freedom is apt to be undisciplined and extravagant. France did not settle down to stable and orderly government till seven years after her Revolution, and the Hebrews after their escape from Egyptian bondage had to wander in the desert for forty years before they were deemed fit to enter the Promised Land. The student of history is, therefore, not surprised that, when the volcanic fires which had been seething under the rock of the autocracy burst forth with shattering power, chaos and ruin appear to be the result. The suddenly liberated Russians threw off all restraint and license ran riot. It will take time for them to learn to use their new-found freedom with wisdom

and moderation. "Universal, direct, equal, and secret suffrage," to use the Grand Duke Michael's phrase, is not likely to be immediately successful among a people the majority of whom are illiterate peasants easily influenced by priests and demagogues. They form excellent raw material, but time is needed for education and discipline. Intelligent and effective democratic government cannot be made over night out of 180,000,000 people who know in a vague way that they want it but have only the crudest notions of what it is and what it involves.

A hopeful element in the situation lay in the splendid ability and forcefulness of the leaders of the Revolution. Prince Lvoff, who at once became Premier, Michael Rodzianko, President of the Duma, former President Alexander Guchkoff, who was given the Ministry of War and Marine, Paul Milyukoff, the leader of the popular party in the Duma and who was made Foreign Minister, Alexander F. Kerensky who was assigned the Ministry of Justice, M. Tereschtenko, Minister of Finance, and others who might be mentioned, were capable men. Their plans had been carefully made and they carried them out

with the swiftness and decisiveness of courage and genius.

Milyukoff, by the way, visited America in 1905, and delivered a series of lectures in Chicago in fluent English. In spite of his ability, however, and his prominent part in bringing about the Revolution, he was not strong enough with the people to hold the leadership. In the stormy days which followed the *coup d'état,* officials rose and fell with startling suddeness. By the middle of May, Milyukoff was forced to resign and his portfolio was taken by M. Tereschtenko. Some other members of the Provisional Government dropped out and Kerensky took the Ministry of War and Marine and began to loom up as the most forceful personality of the hour. July 21 he succeeded Lvoff as Prime Minister.

The rise of this young and comparatively unknown lawyer to world prominence was meteoric in swiftness and brilliancy. Born in Tashkend, Siberia, in 1880, he studied law, became the champion of the poor and persecuted, defended the workmen in the River Lena strike, was one of the counsel for the defence in the prosecution of the Jew Mendel

Belis on the charge of ritual murder at Kief, was elected to the Duma as a representative of Socialist Labour, incurred the wrath of the Government by his bold criticisms, and when the Tsar's decree dissolving the Duma was read, it was Kerensky who rose and exclaimed: "We will not go; we stay here." Few men of this turbulent time are more interesting than this youthful leader, still in his thirties, frail of body and suffering from tuberculosis, but blazing with zeal, indomitable in spirit, and toiling ceaselessly to bring order out of chaos.

But the difficulties of the new Government are many and great. The reactionary autocrats, while corrupt and cruel, are not weak and they cannot be expected to submit with meekness to total ruin. They publicly professed allegiance to the Provisional Government, but secretly they are doing everything in their power to foment trouble. They are pastmasters in political intrigue and there are many, both within and without the country, who are disposed to aid them. The Government of course knows this and it is keeping sharp watch upon them.

Other dangers were more imminent. A war

of stupendous proportions was in progress. The Allies hoped for a more vigorous and effective prosecution of it; but a nation that is reorganizing its entire governmental machinery at home is not in a favourable position to bring its united strength to bear upon a foreign foe. Many of the soldiers sympathize with the cause of the common people from whose homes they came, and care had been exercised to see that the regiments in Petrograd were friendly to the Revolution. The majority of the rank and file prior to the outbreak of the war with Germany had always been simple-minded, docile men who had shown a disquieting willingness to shoot as they were ordered whether the objects were friends or foes. Their blind fidelity was long the bulwark of the autocracy. They guarded the Tsar on all his journeys, and on scores of occasions ruthlessly turned their guns upon the crowds who humbly brought petitions to his palace. Most of the soldiers and line officers of this type were killed in the war before the Revolution broke out, and the men who took their places were in closer sympathy with the people of whom they were so recently a part. The unregulated zeal of these new levies soon

precipitated worse evils, as we shall presently see. Their officers promptly promised obedience to the Provisional Government; but how many did so because they knew that they would be cashiered and probably executed if they refused, and how many were actuated by sympathy with the Revolution remains to be seen. Nearly all the high civil, military, and naval posts were in the hands of the reactionary party, and it is not a light thing to bring in a new set of officials when a powerful enemy is thundering at the gates of the Empire.

The gravest peril lay in dissensions and impracticable schemes among the revolutionists themselves. Within forty-eight hours from the abdication of the Tsar, an inflammatory document entitled "Order No. 2" was widely distributed in Petrograd, posted on walls and even in the lobbies of the Duma. It was signed by a committee of labour deputies, soldiers, and delegates, and it summoned the army to disregard the Duma's claims to authority and not to obey officers who recognized it. A public meeting, called by the Committee of Labour Deputies the next day, was attended by 1,300 delegates. The revolution-

ists quickly divided into moderates and radicals, and the latter began to clamour for the most extreme measures.

An organization known as the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies virtually took power out of the hands of the Provisional Government, claiming the right to speak for the people, to tell the Duma what it ought to do, and to announce programmes in national and international affairs. This organization was described by the Petrograd "Russkaiya Volia" as "a fortuitous aggregation of workmen and soldiers, mainly well-intentioned but ignorant folk who have fallen under the domination of an ultra-Socialist clique." It proceeded to carry matters with a high hand. When, April 27, the Provisional Government published a manifesto to the people of Russia explaining the objects sought in the war, and followed it with a note to the other governments concerned to the effect that the Revolution did not imply any change in the determination of Russia to take her full part in the common struggle of the Entente Allies against the Central Powers, the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies angrily protested and insisted that the Provi-

sional Government had no right to issue declarations of policy without consultation with the Council. A formidable public demonstration was made, crowds assembling in front of the headquarters of the Provisional Government, carrying red flags and banners with such inscriptions as "Down with Milyukoff!" "Down with Guchkoff, Minister of War!" "Down with the Provisional Government!" At a largely attended meeting, a resolution of confidence in the Provisional Government was carried by the slender majority of thirty-five in a total vote of twenty-five hundred. The Council went further and issued orders that the Petrograd garrison, which was held in the capital by order of the Provisional Government to be in readiness to oppose any movement against the Revolution, "may henceforth be sent to the front if needed, provided authority is first given by the Council." "Directly challenging the Government," said one of Milyukoff's newspaper organs, "the Workmen's and Soldiers' Committee has ordered that no troops leave the barracks without signed permission of the Committee. Power over the troops is thus transferred from the Commander-in-Chief to the President of the

Soldiers' and Workmen's Committee. No Government can agree to such a situation."

The spirit of turbulence soon manifested itself in alarming ways in the army. The enlisted men began to hold meetings, to arrest and imprison their generals, and to demand that important movements should not be undertaken without the consent of the soldiers themselves. April 15, the Council of Soldiers' Delegates cashiered several officers of high rank in different parts of the country, among them the famous General Alexi Kuropatkin, who was Commander-in-Chief of the Russian armies in the Russia-Japan War, who had been in command of the Russian armies on the northern front in the European War and who, at the time of his dismissal by the Council of Soldiers' Delegates, was Governor-General of Turkestan. Four other generals were arrested at the same time and confined in a guard-room. Minister of War Guchkoff so far yielded to the clamour as to issue an order the last of April, virtually placing the government of the army in the hands of the troops by directing each army corps, regiment, and company to elect a special committee to maintain discipline, control food

supplies, take justifiable measures against abuse of power by military chiefs, settle disputes between officers and soldiers, and make preparations for the election of delegates to a constituent assembly which would decide on the future government of Russia. In May, several generals holding important commands, although they had unequivocally avowed their loyalty to the Provisional Government, sent in their resignations because they found it impossible to maintain discipline or to assume responsibility when their orders "were annulled by other organizations," the Executive Committee of the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates having directed them to present their orders to the Committee for its endorsement. June 1, the Council, by a vote of 210 to 40, took possession of the great Kronstadt fortress which commands the capital.

The navy showed like demoralization. The common sailors held meetings, passed judgment upon the fitness of their officers, deprived several admirals and captains of their commands, and elected others who were more popular.

Such actions boded ill for the success of a

nation at war with a powerful enemy. "The Russian army which was so formidable yesterday is stricken today with fatal impotency and that, too, in the face of a terrible and tenacious enemy," bewailed General Alexieff, Commander-in-Chief of the army, to a congress of delegates of army and navy officers.

Meantime the soldiers, hearing that the great landed estates of the nobles were being divided up among the people and that a man must be present in order to get his share, began to desert in large numbers. So grave did this danger become that the Minister of War felt obliged to issue an appeal to the men not to leave the front, assuring them that their interests would not be overlooked. He added that the number of soldiers deserting had become dangerously large and that "all Russia is stricken at the sad news from the front." By May 9, the situation had become so acute that the Provisional Government issued a proclamation which included the following rather pathetic statements:

"The attempts by separate groups of the population to realize their desires by expropriations or launching declarations when

made by the less organized classes threatens to ruin interior discipline and unity and create favourable ground on the one hand for acts of violence against the new régime, and on the other hand for the development of private interests to the detriment of the general welfare. The temporary Government considers it its duty to declare frankly and definitely that such conditions render the administration of the country extremely difficult and menace it with interior ruin and defeat at the front. The frightful spectre of civil war and anarchy hovers over Russia, threatening its freedom. There is a dark, sad path leading through civil war and anarchy to the return to despotism. This must not be the path of the Russian people."

The leaders in the Revolution of 1905 were so violent and extreme that, after a brief period of apparent success, a counter-revolution overthrew them and restored the autocracy. No less a Russian than Count Ilya Tolstoy, son of the great Count Tolstoy, has expressed grave anxiety lest a similar reaction may follow the Revolution of 1917. "The only thing that I fear," he said, "is that the

Socialists of the extreme left will be too radical. I don't approve at all of the rights given to soldiers. You do not give such rights to soldiers in this or any other republic or any kind of government. A soldier must not rule; he must be commanded. In this I see great danger. It is a sign of disorganization. I believe that disorganization will be averted and that the new Government will maintain itself, but I cannot help recognizing the sign of danger. It was the extreme Socialists who checked the Revolution in 1905. They went so far as to produce a reaction. Their policies result in anarchy, and it is in anarchy that the dark forces come into power. There is some danger that extreme radicalism may bring about the re-establishment of autocratic government." [1]

To add to the confusion members of the Provisional Government put forth such variant opinions as to indicate that they themselves were not agreed as to the course that should be pursued. They contradicted one another in the public press, one minister declaring that the statement of another minister did not represent the viewpoint of the

[1] Interview in the New York Times, April 21, 1917.

Government. Cabinet membership changed with kaleidescopic suddenness, no less than five ministers resigning at one time in July over the question of autonomy for the Ukraine.

As the weeks passed, confusion became worse confounded. M. Guchkoff, Minister of War and Marine, frankly described the situation, May 10, in an address to the delegates and former members of the Duma who had assembled in the Tauride Palace to celebrate the anniversary of the opening of the first Duma:

"Unfortunately the first feeling of radiant joy evoked by the Revolution soon gave place to one of pain and anxiety. The destruction of the old forms of public life, to which an end had been put by the Revolution, had been effected more rapidly than had the creation of new forms to replace them. It is especially regrettable that the destruction has touched the political and social organization of the country before any life centre has had time to establish itself, and to carry out the great creative work of regeneration. How will the State emerge from this crisis? . . . The duality and power—and even polyarchy—and

the consequent anarchy now prevailing in the country make its normal existence difficult. Our poor country is fighting at an extraordinary hard conjuncture of an unparalleled war and internal troubles such as we never have seen before, and only a strong governmental power able to rely on the confidence of the nation can save it. . . . For the moment we hoped our military powers would emerge from the salutary process regenerated and renewed in strength and that a new reasonable discipline would weld the army together; but that has not been the case, and we must frankly face the fact that our military might is weakened and disintegrated, being affected by the same disease as the country, namely, duality of power, polyarchy, and anarchy, only the malady is more acute. It is not too late to cure it, but not a moment must be lost. . . . Some time ago the country realized that our mother land was in danger. Since then we have gone a step further, for our mother land is on the edge of an abyss."

Four days later, General Guchkoff gave up and resigned, saying: "In view of the condi-

tion in which the power of the Government has been placed, I can no longer share responsibility for the grave sin being committed against the country."

Even the lion-hearted Kerensky, despairingly exclaimed in an appeal to soldiers' delegates from the front May 14:

"My strength is at an end. I no longer feel my former courage, nor have my former conviction that we are conscientious citizens, not slaves in revolt. I am sorry I did not die two months ago when the dream of a new life was growing in the hearts of the Russian people, when I was sure the country could govern itself without the whip. As affairs are going now, it will be impossible to save the country. . . . The process of the change from slavery to freedom is not going on properly. We have tasted freedom and are slightly intoxicated. What we need is sobriety and discipline."

"We are walking on the edge of a knife across an abyss," said the Socialist Minister of Labour, M. Skobeleff, at a meeting May 27. A few weeks later, a Pan-Russian Congress of Councils of Deputies of Soldiers and

Workmen met in Petrograd, and June 23 voted to abolish the Duma and the Council of the Empire, which had been reorganized in 1906 as a co-ordinate legislative chamber with the Duma, half of its members to be appointed and the other half elected. The Duma, which had defied the Tsar's order to dissolve, now defied the order of the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies.

In June, the indomitable spirit of Kerensky reasserted itself. He visited the army at the front and so stirred the soldiers by his impassioned appeals that they wildly cheered him and readily followed him into a vigorous attack upon the enemy. He returned to Petrograd to assure his colleagues in the Government that the army, like the nation, had simply been passing through a period of transition and could now be depended upon to do its duty. Let us hope so; but the spectacle of a civilian Secretary of War making speeches to mass meetings of soldiers, and then taking the command out of the hands of their general and personally leading them into battle, is not exactly military. Troops that require that kind of stimulus are an uncertain dependence for a long campaign. The next orator might

turn their emotions into a different channel.

These things look ominous. The situation shifts from week to week, sometimes from day to day, and it may be better or worse by the time these pages are printed. The political kaleidescope is whirling so rapidly that nothing can be predicted with confidence. The British and French ambassadors are doing everything in their power to prevent the collapse of Russia's military efforts, and in the early summer of 1917 the American Government added its assistance and earnest counsel. July 22, the Executive Committees of the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies and the Council of Peasants' Delegates, frightened by the signs of national disintegration and peril, adopted the following resolution by a vote of 252 to 57:

"Recognizing that the country is menaced by a military debacle on the front and by anarchy at home, it is resolved:

"First—That the country and the Revolution are endangered.

"Second—That the Provisional Government is proclaimed the government of national safety.

"Third—That unlimited powers are accorded the Government for re-establishing the organization and discipline of the army, for a fight to the finish against the enemies of public order and for the realization of the whole programme embodied in the governmental programme just announced."

This resolution made Kerensky, who had been made Prime Minister only the day before, virtually the Dictator of Russia. Napoleon Bonaparte rose no more quickly from obscurity to supreme power than this youthful Russian. Will his patriotic unselfishness and his balance of judgment be equal to the sudden and tremendous strain upon them? They have been thus far and to an extraordinary degree. It should be remembered that while Napoleon came from the army and had the professional soldier's temper and point of view, Kerensky came from the ranks of the people in civil life, and that he brought to his great opportunity the temper and point of view of a progressive and enlightened sympathy with humanity. No one who knows him doubts his loyalty to the cause of the people whom he leads; but grave are the fears

that his physical strength may collapse, for his burdens are heavy enough to break a man of iron constitution, and the hand of disease is upon him. As we think of his splendid spirit in its frail tenement of flesh, we may say of him what the Apostle John said of his valued friend Gaius: "Beloved, I pray that in all things thou mayest prosper and be in health even as thy soul prospereth"; for if Kerensky were as strong in body as he is in soul, well would it be for his native land.

Friends in other lands should remember that newspaper correspondents naturally cable to their home papers about the events which appear most prominently on the surface and are deemed most interesting and telling from the viewpoint of public news. Any country so vast in area and population as Russia, and with such diverse elements of population, is apt to have trouble of some sort most of the time. An American reader might get the impression from cabled despatches that all the Chinese are engaged in killing one another, and a European that lynchings and strike riots keep the cities of the United States in perpetual turmoil. In like manner Americans, who depend upon daily despatches for their

knowledge of what is taking place in Russia, may conclude that bloodshed and ruin are universal. As a matter of fact, while the political and military situation is seriously alarming, there are many millions of the Russian people who are peacefully pursuing their ordinary avocations. It is undoubtedly true that the Revolution is shaking Russian life to its depths and that a transformation of tremendous proportions is taking place; but actual fighting among the people themselves is not so general as the casual reader might imagine. It may be a considerable time before the new Russia will settle down to stability of government and national life; but hope is strong. Mr. Root, on his return from Russia, frankly admitted that "it cannot be said that the bottom has been struck"; but he added an expression of his confidence that the Russian people would work out their difficult problem in a satisfactory way and that he believed that "the prospects are certainly bright."

Commenting on Mr. Root's statement in Petrograd, that the friends of liberty in Russia should not be dismayed by differences of opinion since "democracies are always in trouble," Dr. Frank Crane adds: "So is everything

else that is alive. The only place where there is no trouble is the grave. Trouble is a function of life. It is a symptom of change. It is an incident of progress. 'I came not to bring peace, but a sword.' In the evolution of any truth there are bound to be upheavals, overturnings, downcastings, and quakes. A democracy is a growing nation. A government by absolutism has the deceptive perfection of death. In self-government a people finds itself, realizes its defects, and learns to self-amend them. Absolutism never knows how bad it is. In America, Congress is always squabbling, the Senate is always objecting, newspapers are always exposing, preachers warning, politicians denouncing, women complaining, soapbox orators declaiming; we have prohibitionists, single taxers, populists, greenbackers, free silverites, socialists, the A.P.A., suffragettes, anarchists, pacifists; the minority is lively and vociferous. No party, even led by Gabriel and composed of angels, would be allowed to manage things in peace, because America is alive, surging with tides of strength. The theory of Prussia is to suppress the man who opposes the Government. The theory of democracy is to hire him a hall."

VI

PROPOSED REFORMS AND THEIR PROBABLE LIMITATIONS

SPECULATION is naturally rife regarding the specific reforms which the revolutionary parties will undertake. Predictions are numerous. Unfortunately, most of them represent the hopes of the predictors rather than a knowledge of the underlying factors. Among the internal reforms confidently announced are popular education, freedom of speech and press, land and economic reforms, religious liberty, autonomy of Finland and Poland, and liberation of the Jews.

The first three will probably come to pass, as the denial of them was among the grievances of the revolutionists and their attainment was one of the primary objects of the revolt. It is reasonable to assume therefore that important measures will be inaugurated in these directions.

A pathetically stirring event that quickly occurred was the liberation of political con-

victs from prison and exile. The President of the Exile Committee in Ekaterinburg said that there were about 100,000 exiles in Siberia who were released by the amnesty proclamation of the Provisional Government. As soon as the glad news became known, these exiles began to stream back to Russia. From remote mines and convict settlements they came, in sledges or on foot, over wide wastes of snow to the Trans-Siberian Railway; men and women, old and young, some emaciated by privation, some ill and many ragged and unkempt, but all with light hearts and radiant faces because the weary, awful years of injustice and agony had ended and life once more held the promise of liberty. Pitiful those long processions were, and yet sublime, too, with the sublimity of suffering endured and of hope reborn. Worthy of a great painter was the scene in the railway station of Petrograd in April when Mme. Breshkovskaya, "grandmother of the Russian Revolution," arrived. Forty-four of the seventy-three years of her life she had spent in exile, and now in her old age, bent and feeble in body but mighty as ever in soul, she returned to a welcome that a queen might have envied.

Multitudes thronged the streets near the station and mingled acclamations and tears as she alighted from the train. In the gorgeously decorated room which had been reserved for visiting kings and emperors and royal princes, stood M. Kerensky, the successor of the Minister of Justice who had sent her to Siberia, surrounded by men and women who, during the days of the autocracy, had lived like hunted animals, among them Miss Vera Zassulich, who had shot General Trepoff, the Governor of St. Petersburg, years before and whose son was now himself a prisoner while the woman who had tried to kill his father walked abroad in freedom. Surely Mme. Breshkovskaya might have exclaimed with Simeon of old: "Now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace; for mine eyes have seen thy salvation."

As for the other reforms, let us devoutly hope that they also will come to pass. Beyond question they are needed. But the best we can say now is that, while they are possible, they are far from certain in the near future.

Religious liberty depends not only upon laws but upon the attitude of the dominant Church. A well-informed historian asserts

that the Holy Orthodox Church has learned nothing since the sixth century. The Holy Synod, composed of monks appointed by the Tsar, was long a bulwark of autocracy. "The Russian Sacred Synod," says Theodore Ruyssen, "has always been a means of Russification in Finland, Poland, the Ukraine, and it is well known that during the temporary occupation of Galicia a cloud of priests swarmed over the country which had been promised liberty and that the Catholic bishop of the Ukraine was sent to Siberia." One of the early acts of the revolutionists was to dissolve the Synod and to appoint as Procurator the wise and progressive V. Lvoff. His task is difficult. It is easy to change the leaders of a State establishment, but it is far from easy to change the character of a Church which is rooted in the immemorial convictions of its membership. Many of the priests, while devoted and self-sacrificing, are uneducated men, knowing little of the great movements of Christianity outside of their own country and regarding other forms of faith as dangerous heresies. Latin America painfully shows that there may be little real religious liberty even when laws technically guarantee it. It is small comfort for a humble non-conform-

ist to know that there is a law in his favour on the statute books when it is not supported by local sentiment and when he has neither the money nor the knowledge of legal resources to invoke its protection in the courts. Life in Russia may still be very uncomfortable for dissenters, and there are 12,000,000 in one sect alone—the Old Believers. On the other hand, some of the bishops and priests are educated men of marked breadth of mind and catholicity of spirit. The number of such men has materially increased during recent years. The Revolution has brought them to leadership so that the best elements in the Church are now in the ascendant. These intelligent and capable men are eager to see this great historic Communion come out into the wide spaces of truly catholic Christianity and become one of the spiritually uplifting influences of the world. And therein is large hope for the future.

The Jews, of whom there are 5,000,000, will probably not suffer in the future, as they have in the past, from massacres deliberately fomented by Government officials, and kindly neighbours will doubtless show less hesitancy in befriending them. Indeed, the Provisional Government took early occasion to promulgate

a decree which included the following declarations under the heading:

"Repeal of Religious and National Restriction:

"Being conclusively convinced that in a free country all citizens should be equal before the law, and that the conscience of the people cannot be reconciled with limitations on the rights of citizens based on their religion and origin,

"The Provisional Government decrees:

"All existing legal restrictions upon the rights of Russian citizens in connection with this or that faith, religious teaching, or nationality are revoked.

"In accordance with this:

"1. Repealed are all the laws existing for Russia as a whole, as well as those of separate localities, the limitations concerning:

"1. Selection of place of residence and change of residence or movement.

"2. Acquiring rights of ownership and other material rights in all kinds of movable and immovable property, and likewise in the possession of, the use and the managing of, all property, or receiving such for security.

"3. Engaging in all kinds of trades, commerce, and industry, not excepting mining; also equal participation in the bidding for Government contracts, deliveries, and in public auctions.

"4. Participation in joint stock and other commercial or industrial companies and partnerships, and also employment in these companies and partnerships in all kinds of positions, either by election or by hiring.

"5. Employment of servants, salesmen, foremen, labourers, and trade apprentices.

"6. Entering the Government service, civil as well as military, and the grade or condition of such service; participation in the elections for the institutions of local self-government and all kinds of public institutions; serving in all kinds of positions of government and public establishments, as well as the prosecution of the duties connected with such positions.

"7. Admission to all kinds of institutions of learning, whether private, Government, or public, and the pursuing of the courses of instruction of these institutions and receiving scholarships. Also the pursuance of teaching and other educational professions.

"8. Performing the duties of guardians, trustees, or jurors.

"9. The use of languages and dialects other than Russian in the proceedings of private societies, or in teaching in all kinds of private educational institutions and in commercial bookkeeping."

Paragraphs 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 enumerate the existing laws that were to be repealed, and their number and variety afforded startling evidence of the thoroughness with which animosity toward the Jews had sought to make their lot legally impossible. Paragraph 9 of the decree of the Provisional Government added the following welcome declaration to the Jews in the United States and other lands who have long chafed under the refusal of the Russian Government to recognize American passports to Jews who wish to visit Russia:

"The force of this decree is extended to embrace the corresponding restrictions which have been enacted in relation to foreigners not belonging to the citizenship of the countries with which Russia is at war, in connection

with their faith, religious teaching, or nationality."

These are surely sweeping and altogether satisfactory deliverances. One hopes that they will stand. The Provisional Government, however, could make regulations only until the meeting of the Constituent Assembly, which alone has power to enact permanent laws. The decree that has been quoted is of large interest nevertheless as an expression of the desire of the revolutionary leaders. If the Constituent Assembly shall place the decree on the statute books of the new Russia, one of the legislative iniquities of the world will be abolished and beneficent regulations will take its place.

The question of giving practical effect to such legislation may prove to be another matter. Americans well know that it is one thing to put a good law on the statute books and quite another thing to enforce it, for they have scores of laws which are dead letters because there is not sufficient public interest in them to demand and secure their enforcement. This difficulty is quite as likely to exist in Russia as in America, especially in relation to the

Jews. Whatever may be the wording of the statutes, the fundamental causes of Russian antipathy to the Jews will still remain, for they are racial, religious, and economic rather than political. The Slav is nationalistic to the point of clannishness and he instinctively dislikes and distrusts "the alien Jew." Intense in his devotion to the forms of his religion, the Russian despises "the people who crucified Christ."

Financial dealings intensify racial and religious prejudices. The Jews in Russia, as elsewhere, are not farmers or mechanics. They are well represented in the professions, but their characteristic pre-eminence is in trade and finance. They are the bankers, the money lenders, and pawn-brokers of the country. The typical Russian is as careless and improvident as a child in money matters. He borrows heedlessly and with little thought as to how or when payment is to be made. When he can offer security in land, buildings, or other property, the Jew readily complies with his requests for loans. Interest rates are usually high. When interest or principal falls due, the Russian is often unable to pay and the Jew is obliged to exert pressure to collect

his money. The debtor then becomes angry and if a mortgage is foreclosed, as it often is, he becomes the Jew's rancourous enemy. One reason why officials so often incited mobs to attack the Jews lay in the fact that many of them owed the Jews large sums which they could not or would not pay. The Russian temperament, while ordinarily good-natured, is easily stirred to fanatical fury, and the profligate officials seldom had any difficulty in rousing the inflammable prejudices and passions of the populace.

These conditions are not likely to be materially changed by the Revolution. The Russian will probably be as heedless in money matters as he was before, the thriftier Jew will be as willing as before to loan him money, and the Russian will be as furious as before when he is compelled to meet his obligations. Stephen Graham knows the Russians well and he writes: "The Russian patriot cannot tolerate the Jew; he sees in him the whole instinct of materialism and westernism and commercialism. . . . The Russians are positively afraid of the Jews. . . . It is with the Jewish business spirit and Jewish enmity towards Christianity that the Russian has his quarrel,

. . . the fundamental opposition of the Jewish character to that which is most precious in the Slav. . . . The fundamentally Slavonic, the mystical, the careless, that part of the soul of the Russians which makes them like the Celts in temperament, cannot agree with the Jew. To him the Jew is poison." [1] If any one innocently imagines that a democracy secures just and equal treatment of members of a different and disliked race, he may find humiliating corrective in the ill-treatment of Negroes, Chinese, and Japanese in the alleged most democratic country in the world, the United States of America.

The attitude of the new Government toward its subject peoples will be watched with deep interest. The population of Russia is far from being so homogeneous as many in other lands imagine it to be. The appeal of the League of Foreign Nations of Russia to Prime Minister Asquith of Great Britain in 1916, indicated the discordant variety of peoples that geographical Russia includes. Some of them are so different from the dominant race and with such conflicting ideas and ambi-

[1] "Russia and the World, pp. 154-161.

tions that the Empire has been held together only by the iron hand of an absolute despotism. Now that this despotism has been shattered, will the variant elements cohere in an era of freedom, or will they resolve themselves into their separate parts?

Finland, Poland, and perhaps one or two other subject provinces, doubtless will be given fairer treatment than they had under the rule of the Tsar. It is to be hoped that at least they will be permitted to have their own police, school teachers, and other community officials, and that they will not be continually watched and hampered as if they were prisoners in a concentration camp, as they virtually have been in the past. Indeed, the Provisional Government issued a proclamation to all Poles, March 30, 1917, to the effect that there will be "a new and independent Poland formed of all the three now separate parts," and that it was the desire of the Government that they should determine for themselves, in a constitutional assembly on the basis of universal suffrage, what the form of their government should be. This was probably intended, in part at least, as an offset to Germany's offer of autonomy to Russian

Poland; but the kind of independence that the Provisional Government had in mind was naïvely indicated in the following sentences of the proclamation:

"Free Russia calls you to her ranks in the fight for the liberty of the people. . . . Bound to Russia by a free military union, the Polish State will be a solid rampart against the pressure of the Central Powers against the Slav nation."

The proclamation significantly added that it would lie with the Constituent Assembly of Russia definitely to consolidate the new fraternal union and to give its consent to the modifications of Russian territories indispensable to the formation of a free Poland, and the document concluded by appealing to the Poles to accept the offer in the spirit of free brotherhood and to prepare to usher in a new and brilliant era of Polish history. It was easy for the Provisional Government to offer autonomy to Poland when "all the three now separate parts" were in the hands of Germany and Austria.

April 10, the Provisional Government is-

sued another statement which included the following:

"The Government deems it to be its duty to declare now that free Russia does not aim at the domination of other nations, at depriving them of their national patrimony, or at occupying by force foreign territories, but that its object is to establish a durable peace on the rights of nations to decide their own destinies."

This declaration has been deservedly praised as an expression of a high motive whose general adoption would go far not only toward stopping the European War but toward preventing future wars. Whether the new Russia will adhere to such a programme remains to be seen. When a stable and responsible government shall have been established, it may or may not consider itself bound by statements made by some of the rapidly changing officials of the period of reconstruction. What does such a statement mean anyway? The belligerent governments on both sides talk virtuously about "the independence of weaker peoples and their right to decide their own af-

fairs without dictation from without." But no great Power shows a disposition to give independence to any people that it rules; its solicitude is for the weaker peoples that its enemy rules. France and Germany have no intention of voluntarily relinquishing their Asiatic and African possessions. Italy is not thinking of releasing Tripoli. Great Britain would be foolish to give independence to India, Egypt, and Ireland, and would plunge them into civil war if she did. America intends to give independence to the Filipinos when they are fitted for it; America to be the judge of fitness and time. As for Russia, the emancipation of her numerous subject peoples would mean the disintegration of the nation. We doubt whether the new Russia will relinquish any territory which she actually holds or tolerate any movement to impair control over it. Her leaders are disposed to be reasonably considerate of the Finns and Poles, if they can get the latter away from Germany, and if these peoples do what the Government thinks that they should do, harmony will prevail; but if they assert real independence, it is not difficult to imagine what will happen. The very revolutionary leaders who issued

such a gracious declaration about "the rights of nations to decide their own destinies" balked when the representatives of the Ukraine took them at their word and demanded self-government on the ground that the inhabitants of the Ukraine were a separate people and should have the right to manage their own affairs. The dispute waxed so sharp that the Cabinet was split and threats of violence were made. The American Civil War showed that even the most democratic of nations will not permit its unity to be broken.

The influence of Socialism in the revolutionary movement should not be overlooked. It would be too much to say that the movement is exclusively socialistic, for some who were active in it undoubtedly would disavow such a connection for themselves. There were reasons enough in all conscience why a Russian should oppose the bureaucratic government of the Tsar independently of any convictions that he might have regarding a different organization of society. On the other hand, a very large number of the revolutionists are Socialists, and the whole propaganda has been linked in various ways with the socialistic movement which has attained such

large proportions in other European countries, notably in Germany and France, and which is rapidly growing in America. Socialists dominate the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies, the Social Democrats are an influential element in the Duma, and Kerensky and several of his associates in the Provisional Government are Socialists. In an election in June, 1917, in the newly created sub-municipal districts of Petrograd, in which all adult men and women voted on an equal footing, out of 700,447 votes cast, 530,000 were for Socialist candidates, a significant illustration of relative strength. "In Russia there is a Socialist Government," says Prime Minister Lloyd George of Great Britain.[1] We may therefore expect that socialistic ideas will affect the kind of control that will be established and the objects that it will endeavour to achieve.

This consideration is rendered more serious by the fact that the sternly repressive rule of the autocracy made the Russian Socialists more extreme than most of their brethren in other countries. The frightful cruelties to which they had been subjected drove many of them into the fury of anarchism and

[1] Address in the House of Commons, August 13, 1917.

nihilism. There are many sane and moderate Socialists in Russia, but the proportion of extremists is considerably higher than in western Europe and the United States. Kerensky's Socialism is too moderate for the Maximalists, as a section of the Socialists is called, and they demand more radical measures. In their mind the Revolution was against not only the government of the Tsar but against capital. Said the newspaper organ of the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies in June:

"The Russian revolutionary democracy knows very well that the road to the passionately awaited universal peace lies only through a united struggle of the labouring classes with the imperialists of the world." A few days after the Revolution, a great procession marched through the streets of Petrograd to the doors of the Duma bearing red banners inscribed with such mottoes as "Death to Tyrants!" and "Freedom of Land!" June 1, another procession bore black banners inscribed: "Down with Authority!" "Down with Capitalists!" "Long Live the Social Revolution and the Commune!"

The land question is a vital one with the peasantry. The imperial family and the great nobles held enormous tracts. The Tsar alone owned 21,000,000 acres of the best land in Russia and 100,000,000 acres in Siberia. Some of the members of the Provisional Government were large landholders, among them Rodzianko, the President of the Duma. The determination of the tenant farmers to confiscate these extensive estates forms an agrarian factor in the Revolution which should not be overlooked.

Another disquieting feature is the attitude of this socialistic party toward religion. The fact that the Holy Orthodox Church was the State Church, that it was essentially a part of the Government and that it was absolutely controlled by the autocracy, identified it in the minds of the revolutionists with the whole grievous system which they were trying to overthrow. The revolutionary movement, therefore, is not only an anti-autocratic but an anti-Church movement. The strongly religious temperament of the Russian peasant will doubtless prevent the masses of the people from being driven into atheism, but the majority of the educated classes in Russia, in

so far as they have been opposed to the Government, are permeated with hostility to the Church and to the religion for which they think that the Church stands. Those of us who count religion, in a right sense of the term, as a healthful and stabilizing influence in a nation, while in thorough sympathy with the determined effort of the Russian people to destroy the corrupt and reactionary Government from which they suffered so long, and while rejoicing unstintedly with them in their new found liberty, cannot but ask with some apprehension whether the forces that are now in control in Russia will found a new government which will be radically socialistic and irreligious.

Whatever may become true in any or all of these particulars, the general presumption may be safely cherished that the worst abuses of autocratic Russia, if not wholly removed, will be lessened in considerable degree. At any rate, the abuses of the future will be those of the people and their chosen representatives rather than those of arrogant bureaucrats who ruled without regard to justice or humanity. The Russian people have risen in the might of moral indig-

nation and have overthrown, let us hope forever, a despotic government which claimed absolute power by divine right, responsible not to man but to God, and God conceived as a national deity whose will was that the autocracy should do as it pleased irrespective of the wishes of the people or even of the moral quality of its own course. An oppressed and long-suffering nation has set its face toward a better day. I emphasize the consideration that public opinion in other lands should remember that political, economic, and social upheavals have always been followed by periods of disturbance. A revolution against such conditions as existed in Russia is necessarily a destructive process in its earlier stages. The old must be pulled down before the new can be built. Let us not be deceived therefore by the crashing timbers and the chaotic débris. Another and fairer structure will arise in due time.

While the Russian autocrats were narrow, bigoted, and corrupt, the Russian people have many excellent qualities. It is true that the masses are ignorant, superstitious, and sodden under centuries of poverty and oppression. The typical peasant is a big hulking fellow,

with matted, unkempt hair and beard, unclean person and habits, and with the animal characteristics strongly developed. Ordinarily patient and amiable, he is subject to sudden and unreasoning outbursts of frenzy during which his passions and cruelties are those of an untamed savage. The Russian pilgrims that I saw in Jerusalem and some of the immigrants in Siberia impressed me as lower in the scale of intelligence and civilization than the coolies of China. As a soldier, however, this Russian peasant is patient, docile, and obedient. Heavily loaded with impedimenta, he uncomplainingly makes long marches, sleeps upon the wet ground under the open sky, buffets his way through mud and snow, eats the coarsest food, toils patiently, lustily sings as he works and marches, superstitiously venerates his icon, reverently kneels to receive priestly blessing before he goes into battle, fights bravely, and meets wounds and death without a tremor.

"But let us remember that yesterday he was a serf who could be sold as the ox and the horse. If he ran away or dared to present a petition against his master, he was beaten

with the knout or sent to the mines in Siberia. His proprietor could impose on him every kind of labour, could take from him money dues, could demand from him personal service, and could send the promising youth to the army. Is it strange, then, that these men bear in their body and mind the marks of twenty centuries of serfdom? And yet this peasant—the heir of five centuries of vassalage—is good-natured and pacific, is adaptable and imperturbable, has an instinct for organization, is an apt pupil under competent masters, is admirably fitted for the work of peaceful agricultural colonization, is long-suffering and conciliatory, and capable of bearing extreme hardships. When he is taken out of the environment where the blight of serfdom is still felt and comes in contact with foreign nations, he immediately adopts foreign ideas and foreign inventions. When freed from the trammels of hereditary conceptions, when liberated from the bondage of clannish suspicion, when once he treads the path of industrial and commercial speculation, his 'go-ahead' is truly American. . . . Slav peasantry is fallow ground for the seed of a higher civilization, and none better appreciates

the light. This young giant, who 'hath as it were the strength of the wild ox,' and who 'as a lion doth lift himself up,' turns his face, radiant with hope, to the rising sun." [1]

[1] Peter Roberts, quoted in "The Case of Russia," pp. 326-330.

VII

WHY RUSSIA STILL WANTS CONSTANTINOPLE

THE significance of Russia's relationship to the world is profoundly affected by what she is at home, but her policy in relation to foreign affairs is determined in no small degree by considerations which still abide. This foreign policy has been consistently followed for more than a century, and it is not likely to be essentially changed by the progressive party now in power, for it represents the strongest aspirations of the Russian people. There will be no permanent settlement of pending international questions either in Europe or Asia, no stable peace after the war, unless Russia's foreign policy is taken into account. It is, therefore, quite as important to understand it now as it was before the Revolution.

The key to Russia's foreign policy is desire for that access to the open ocean, which is indispensable to influential participation in world

affairs. A glance at the map will indicate what plans this necessarily forces upon Russia.

Northward are the frozen White Sea and the inhospitable Arctic. The exigencies of the European War compelled Russia to utilize a hitherto neglected spot on this forbidding coast. The upward sweep of the Gulf Stream so far modifies the temperature at Alexandrovsk on the Kola Bay of Lapland that ships can manage to enter and depart even in winter. It is a bleak and isolated spot, but when Russia's stock of munitions was exhausted by the gigantic scale of military operations, and Germany had closed the usual thoroughfares to western Europe, a railway was hastily begun across the Kola peninsula to Kandalaksha on the White Sea, and from there to Petrograd by way of Kem and Petrozavodsk. Warehouses were erected and were soon jammed with the freight that poured in from Great Britain. This afforded partial relief in that particular emergency and the port will doubtless continue to be used; but it does not solve Russia's permanent problem, for the fifteenth parallel of latitude is too near the North Pole to be a convenient and practicable naval and commercial base for a

nation which aspires to world power. Alexandrovsk is one of the dreariest places on earth. In summer the soil is like a wet sponge and the air is alive with mosquitoes, while winter brings not only bitter cold but an Arctic night of two months' duration.

Westward the Baltic Sea offers a natural outlet. But in order to reach the open ocean by this route, Russia must run the gauntlet of Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Great Britain. For war purposes, therefore, Russia is virtually shut off from the North Atlantic, since the comparatively narrow outlet of the Baltic could be blocked by nations which might be hostile at the time of Russia's greatest need.

The only other route by which European Russia can reach the ocean is the Black Sea. But here the outlet is through the narrow Bosporus and Dardanelles into the Mediterranean. Hence Russia's age-long ambition to obtain Constantinople. Possession of that historic city, beautiful for situation and so incomparable in strategic value that Napoleon called it "the empire of the world," has been fought for ever since the wars of Greece and Troy of which Homer sung in his im-

mortal verse. Within a century after the foundation of the present city by Constantine the Great in the year 330, the strife again waxed fierce. Almost every people in that part of the world have participated in the scramble at one time or another. The Slavs appeared as early as 553 in the reign of Justinian, and between 865 and 1043, the Russians under Michael III and his successors made no less than four attempts to capture the city. After many fierce and bloody assaults, the Turks under Mohammed II finally succeeded in obtaining the coveted prize in 1453 and the Cross of the Christian was displaced by the Crescent of the Moslem. When the five great European Powers balanced their interests in the treaty of 1841, they confirmed Turkey's possession, and this iniquitous agreement was perpetuated by the treaties of London in 1871 and of Berlin in 1878. No warship of any other nation could pass the Dardanelles without Turkey's express permission, and even merchant vessels were compelled to stop and show their papers. In 1891, Russia secured an agreement which allowed her "volunteer fleet" to go through on certain conditions; but for all practical and

emergency purposes, the Dardanelles were absolutely controlled by the Moslem who hated and despised the "infidel dog of a Christian." This was a grievous thing to the Russians. It is true that the Mediterranean is virtually a British lake by virtue of the fact that its two outlets, the Suez Canal and the Straits of Gibraltar, are firmly held by Great Britain; but many rich countries border the Mediterranean. Access to all southern Europe, all northern Africa, and all Asia Minor and Palestine, with outlets to the Atlantic Ocean and the Indian Ocean when at peace with Great Britain and a chance to wrest them from her when at war—these are considerations of the first magnitude in forming a national policy.

Another reason lies in the need of water transportation for imports and exports. Russia, largely an agricultural country, has vast quantities of wheat and other farm products which she wishes to send to outside markets, and she wishes in turn to receive from other countries the machinery and manufactured goods which she does not make for herself. Transportation by railway is too costly, nor are existing or prospective lines able to handle

such heavy traffic. The outlet passage to the Atlantic Ocean by way of the Baltic is too far north, even if it were unobstructed, for the most productive lands are in central and southern Russia where the soil is more fertile and the climate less severe than in the bleak plains around Petrograd. The natural movement of surplus crops is toward the Dardanelles and the waiting markets that border the Mediterranean. Hence Constantinople is an economic necessity for Russia.

The third reason lies in the religious aspirations of the Russian people. Constantinople is to the devout Greek Catholic what Rome is to the devout Roman Catholic—the mother city of his Church. Professor James Y. Simpson quotes one of Russia's best known and devoted sons as saying: "In the Russian Orthodox consciousness, Constantinople till now remains the world-centre of Christianity, and therefore it is the natural capital of the future Orthodox Kingdom. With the name of Constantinople are very closely joined the mystical and cultural hopes of the representatives of the real Russian self-consciousness, and these hopes are alive in us today with renewed force. Orthodox Russia, which is the spiritual

core of the Russian Empire, cannot imagine that Tsargrad (Constantinople) could be anything else but Russian as soon as it ceases to belong to Turkey. The failure of this hope will be an unbearable disappointment for Russia, and I know that the British people realize the value of religion and understand that they must consider religious Russia even more than political or 'intelligent' Russia. . . . The thought of Constantinople is the ozone in the spiritual atmosphere of our people. It has been in their minds all through their history. It is in the cradle of their Christianity. From there they got not merely their religion but much of their culture. Their history resolves itself in their minds into one long warfare between the Crescent and the Cross. Towards the restoration of the Cross upon the dome of St. Sophia the heart of the Russian people goes out in deep devotion as a great symbolic act."

"These words," adds Professor Simpson, "express the loftiest political viewpoint in Russia today." The theme has been worked out by Professor Prince Eugene Trubetzkoy in a pamphlet which is "the most distinctive Russian contribution to the political literature

of the war known to the writer." He reasons that "as domination of the Straits is necessary as security for her daily bread and the possession of Constantinople is necessary as a condition of Russia's imperial power and importance, so the Temple of St. Sophia expresses that for which the whole meaning of Russian life exists, the sole justification of her being and that for which she conducts the present struggle. All the questions of Russian life and the present war are subsumed in this: Will it be possible for Russia to restore the defiled Temple in the sense of again showing to the world the light extinguished by the Turks?" . . . "It is no matter for surprise," Prince Trubetzkoy says, "that the soul of our people was from the earliest times united to the idea of St. Sophia with the greatest hope and with the greatest joy. . . . As proof of this, take the following personal reminiscence: Four years ago I returned to Russia from a long foreign journey through Constantinople. In the mosque of St. Sophia, they showed me on the wall the imprint of the bloody hand of the Sultan who had shed the blood of Christians in this greatest of the orthodox temples on the very

day of the taking of Constantinople. Having killed the worshippers who came there for safety, he wiped his hand on the column and the bloody imprint is shown there still. Immediately after this visit, I went on board a Russian steamer going to Odessa from Palestine, and at once found myself in a familiar atmosphere. On the deck there were gathered a very large group of Russian peasants—pilgrims returning homewards from the Holy Land. Tired with the long journey, badly dressed, and hungry, they were drinking water with hard bread and listening to tales about Constantinople, and of course about the bloody Sultan and the streams of Christian blood which, during more than five centuries, had periodically flowed in this once Christian kingdom. I cannot convey to you how deeply I was moved by what I saw. I saw my own country in Constantinople. There on the mountain had just disappeared the Holy Sophia lighted by the sun, and here before me on the deck was a real Russian village; and at the moment when our boat gently moved along the Bosporus with its mosques and minarets, the whole crowd firmly and solemnly but, I do not know why, in a subdued

voice sang: 'Christ is Risen' (Easter hymn of the Greek Church liturgy). How deep and long-developed was the instinct which I heard in this singing, and how much of soul understanding there was in it! . . . The peasants who sang 'Christ is Risen' could scarcely interpret very well what they understood. But in their religious feeling there was more than any deep understanding. They understood the ferocious Turkish power under which the blood of persecuted peoples flowed; they saw (in their soul) the whole humanity joined in the joy of the Holy Resurrection; but at the same time they felt that they could not express this joy, this hope, which always lives in the soul of the people, now in the centre of the Turkish power, except with a subdued voice, because so long as this power exists and the temper produced by it, Sophia is still far from us; she is in a different sphere. But the time will come when heaven will descend to earth and the eternal idea of humanity will be realized; then this hymn will sound loud and powerful—this hymn which now you hear in a subdued tone. I think no other proof seems necessary that Sophia lives in the soul of our people. But in order to

see and to feel her reality, it is necessary to experience that which these peasants on the steamer felt, and about which they sang." [1]

These are cogent considerations and one does not marvel that they sway both the judgment and the imagination of the Russian people. No one can blame them for regarding the possession of Constantinople as the goal of their national ambitions, the mainspring of their governmental policies, and the object of their hopes and prayers. It is the Holy City, identified with the most sacred associations of their historic faith; and it is as grievous to them that Constantinople is in alien hands as it is to the orthodox Jew that Jerusalem is in the hands of the Moslem. We of other lands should be candid enough to admit that, if we were Russians, we too would share this intense conviction that the city must become Russian. Indeed, Russia would long ago have forced the hated Moslem out of it had they not been prevented by other European powers, chiefly Great Britain. The reason for the opposition is quite intelligible. A great and ambitious military and naval power

[1] Quoted in Professor James Y. Simpson's "The Self-Discovery of Russia," pp. 199-200, 205, and 187-189.

entrenched at the Dardanelles would command unobstructed access to the Suez Canal, which Great Britain jealously guards as her indispensable gateway to India, and would come perilously near being the master of the old world. As a matter of fact, until recent years, the key to Great Britain's foreign policy was a determination to keep Russia out of Constantinople at all hazards. And so the bloodiest monarch in the world long sat secure in his palace overlooking the beautiful Bosporus because, bad as he was, western Europe was not willing to aid in expelling him lest his place might be taken by the still more dangerous Russian. Turkish misrule was confined to Turkey, while Russia's policy was a menace to all southern Europe, western Asia and northern Africa. In 1895, England, France, and Germany failed to use their influence with Turkey to stop the frightful massacres of Armenians, because they did not deem it prudent to alienate the Turks and thus play into the hands of the more dangerous Russia of a reactionary and unscrupulous autocracy. The humane people of Great Britain were filled with grief and indignation and their protests were outspoken. No other

nation has a sounder public conscience, as its witness against the African slave trade and the Congo atrocities clearly proved. But in this case, the Government, while personally sympathetic, dared not run the risk of unleashing the untamed Russian bear into the world arena.

I shall discuss in a later chapter the different alignment of the European Powers which was brought about by the growing strength of Germany, and their reluctant agreement that Russia should have Constantinople in the event of their victory in the War which began in 1914. I continue now the narrative of Russia's efforts to reach the open sea prior to the outbreak of that War.

VIII

RUSSIA'S EASTWARD SWEEP ACROSS NORTHERN ASIA

RUSSIA'S efforts to reach the sea were not confined to the European approach. Long before the outbreak of the European War, Russia, finding her path to Constantinople blocked by jealous western powers, began to make resolute but quiet effort to move southward across the Black Sea into Asiatic Turkey and obtain a foothold at the eastern end of the Mediterranean. She manifested great interest in railroad building in Asia Minor and Palestine. M. Victor Berard of Paris characterized the French and English lines constructed between 1856 and 1886 as railroads of penetration, the German lines begun in 1886 as railroads of transit, and the Russian lines as railroads of occupation. The concessions that Russia wrung from the Sultan threw a clear light on her politico-military ambitions in this part of the world. She obtained the exclusive right to build and operate

all railroads in the vilayets of Trebizond and Erzerum and the promise that only Turks should be given the right to construct railroads in the vilayet of Sivas. As Trebizond is the nearest port to Armenia, Erzerum a powerful military and commercial centre of the interior on the direct road from Tiflis and Kars, and Sivas the converging point of roads from Erzerum on the east, Samsoun on the Black Sea on the north, Angora and Constantinople on the west, Kharput and Mardin on the south-east, Marash and Bayas on the Gulf of Alexandretta on the south, and Konia on the south-west, the strategic significance of Russia's concessions is easily understood. They enabled her to dominate an immense region and to control Great Armenia.

Visitors to Jerusalem have often commented upon the fact that the Russian buildings are far more imposing than any purely religious purpose necessitates. The Russian quarter is of such size and strength, and the lofty Belvidere Tower on the Mount of Olives is so unmistakably adapted to military signaling for that part of Palestine that no one doubts that Russia was preparing for a day when, like Napoleon, she expected Providence to be

"on the side of the heaviest battalions." But in Asia Minor and Palestine, Russia was checkmated by the opposition not only of Great Britain but of France and Germany, which had plans of their own in that region and were not at all disposed to see Russia establish her hegemony over it. The French had long been active in Palestine, and the Germans signalized the Kaiser's visit in October, 1898, by the erection of a palace on the Mount of Olives which is a veritable fortress and which completely overshadows the Russian enclosure.

Another route by which Russia hoped to reach the sea lay through Persia. Russian priests quietly worked among the members of the old Nestorian Church, whose lot had been an unhappy one under the rule of the arrogant Moslem. Protection was offered to all who would enroll themselves in the Holy Orthodox Church. Persecuted and poverty-stricken, it is not surprising that the Nestorians responded to the invitation and that practically the whole of this ancient sect, except that part of it which had become Protestant under the influence of American and English missionaries, was soon received into the Russian Church.

Under the pretext of caring for the multitudes who had thus come under her protection, Russia silently but powerfully strengthened her influence in Persia.

The weak Shah would have yielded sooner than he did if it had not been for the vigilance of other European powers. The British Government was apprehensive that Russian predominance in Persia would bring Russia dangerously near the northern frontier of India, a danger to be prevented at all hazards. The British Minister succeeded in inducing the Shah to promise that no concessions would be given to foreigners to build railways in Persia; but while he was congratulating himself that he had thus checkmated the Russians, the wily Slav obtained from the Shah a concession to construct a carriage-road from the Russian frontier to Teheran, the capital. This appeared innocent enough; but when the carriage-road was completed, it proved to be so carefully constructed that it was virtually the graded bed of a railway; and doubtless investigation, if permitted, would have disclosed the rails and ties waiting at some convenient place beyond the border. The situation became so serious that Lord Lansdowne,

then British Minister for Foreign Affairs, publicly declared that Great Britain would not permit any other European power to entrench itself on the Persian Gulf, the British holding that this policy was imperatively demanded by their interests in India. Lord Kitchener was sent to India for the express purpose of organizing British military resources against an anticipated Russian aggression against the northern frontier. Lord Selborne, First Lord of the Admiralty, publicly declared that "it was useless for a business nation dealing with its liabilities to mince matters. Instead of a vast tract of impassable country separating the two empires, Russia had two railways terminating at the Afghanistan frontier, only a matter of four hundred miles from the Indian railway. He hoped there would never be war between the two countries, but Britons were bound to consider what the Russian military organizations had succeeded in achieving in Manchuria at the end of six thousand miles of a single track railway line, and to govern British military preparations in India accordingly." [1]

The story of the diplomatic skirmishing be-

[1] Address at Bristol, November 14, 1904.

tween Great Britain and Russia over Persia, and the final result in the virtual partition of that unhappy country between the two Powers, is told in detail in W. Morgan Shuster's volume entitled, "The Strangling of Persia." It is not pleasant reading. Poor old Persia was caught between the upper and nether millstones of Russian and British policies and scant attention was paid to her protests.

Meantime, Russia had girded herself for a more colossal effort in the Farther East. Her statesmen did not fail to see that the Pacific Ocean was to be the arena of world events of stupendous significance. Russia was separated from the Pacific by the vast sweep of a continent; but that mighty region was already largely under Russian control. The dream of Siberian conquest had taken tangible form during the life of Ivan the Terrible, 1529-1584. The onset of the savage hordes of northern Asia had ceased, and the disorganized elements scattered over the vast areas of European Russia had been consolidated into a nation. Ivan, a half savage himself as well as a demon in disposition, conquered the Tartar chiefs of Kazan and Astrakhan and made his name so feared that many of the

tribes in northern Asia acknowledged the overlordship of "The White Czar," as he was called. Ivan proudly added "Lord of Siberia" to his already long list of titles and King Edward VI of England recognized his claims by addressing him a letter as "Commander of all Siberia."

Slowly but steadily Russia pressed eastward. The wandering nomads of that sparsely inhabited country could offer no effective resistance and the outside world gave no heed. It could not have stayed the march of the Slav if it had. Professor George Trumbull Ladd has computed that "for three and a quarter centuries Russia had been advancing through Asia at the average rate of twenty thousand square miles annually." [1]

It was a turbulent region whose restless and predatory tribes were always quarrelling and pillaging. Among the principal sufferers was the rich trading house of the Stroganoffs, whose headquarters were at Perm on the western side of the Ural Mountains but who had received from the Czar a grant of an extensive territory east of the Kama River, a tributary of the Volga. On the principle of

[1] "In Korea with Marquis Ito," p. 222.

employing a thief to catch a thief, the company made an agreement in 1580 with the notorious Cossack chieftain, Yermak Timofeyeff, or Irnak Timofevitch as his name is sometimes spelled. This chieftain crossed the Urals at the head of a horde of 1,636 Cossacks, and for four years pushed eastward with a ferocity which swept everything before him. He defeated the Tartar Khans, captured their cities, and conquered the rude tribes in the valleys of the Irtish and Obi rivers. Reports of his victories aroused the pride and cupidity of Russia, and the nation, which had regarded him as a brigand while he lived, transformed him into a hero and saint after his death. Russian hunters, miners, adventurers, and escaped serfs and convicts followed the path that he had marked out. Then Russia made Siberia a penal colony, and sorrowful groups of wretched political and religious exiles began to toil along the hard trails, scourged by their brutal guards and, in many instances, dying beside the road. About 1587, the city of Tobolsk was founded on the Tobol River. The year 1604 saw the beginnings of Tomsk on the Toms River. After that Yeniseisk on the Yenisei in 1619,

Yakoutsk in 1632, Okhotsk on the Okhotsk in 1638, and Atchinsk in 1642 mark successive stages in the Russian advance. By 1649 a noble young officer named Khabaroff had made his way down the Amur River, defeating the Manchurian tribes which opposed his progress. In 1658, the city of Nertchinsk was founded on the Shilka River, a tributary of the Amur, and in 1663 Albasin was made a fortified post.

Trouble naturally developed with the Chinese, who resented the attempt of the Russians to rule a region which they regarded as their own. Fighting ensued in which the Chinese were worsted. Diplomatic negotiations between the two governments followed, and a treaty was signed at Nertchinsk in 1689 which delimited the border between Russian and Chinese possessions. Under the terms of this treaty, Albasin was abandoned, but the Russian rights were recognized in an immense region northward.

Russian influence in Peking was steadily pressed. Envoys to the Chinese capital succeeded in advancing Russian interests in various ways. Russian power and prestige increased. The Russian colony in eastern

Siberia grew. Kamtchatka was annexed in 1807. Count Nicholas Muravief, who became governor of eastern Siberia in 1847, pushed Russian schemes with great vigour. Seeing that the valley of the Amur was a rich region with large possibilities and that control of such a waterway was essential to Russia's plans in the Far East, he built several forts at stragetic points along the river, and August 1, 1850, Admiral Nevelsky unfurled the Russian flag at the mouth of the Amur. In 1857, the Russians intimated that they would "assist" the Chinese Government in quelling the Tai-ping rebellion if China would cede Manchuria to them. China vehemently protested against such terms; but Russia took advantage of the panic in Peking, caused by the Anglo-French expedition, to take full possession of the coveted territory. A Russian fleet in the Gulf of Chih-li suggested such dire possibilities to the Chinese Emperor, who already had France and England against him, that he helplessly acquiesced, and the treaties of Aigun and Tien-tsin in 1858 conceded to Russia the entire country north of the Amur River and the wide territory east of it and its tributary the Ussuri, clear to the Gulf of

Tartary. The treaty of Peking in 1860 secured Russia more territory and the right to trade in all parts of the Empire.

This vast region which the Russians had secured is capable of supporting a huge population. With an area of 4,824,570 square miles, Siberia is a half larger than the United States, which has 3,025,600 square miles. The tundra swamps north of the sixty-fourth parallel are frozen wastes, but southern Siberia is a land of enormously rich mineral, lumber, and agricultural resources. It has noble rivers, like the Obi, the Yenisei, and the Lena. The Amur River in the extreme east can be navigated for a thousand miles, and the Ussuri is also navigable for a long distance. It is estimated that the valley of the Ussuri alone could maintain a population of five millions. The combined area of the Amur and Ussuri provinces is about 880,000 square miles, or more than four times the area of France. Much of this region is a rolling steppe, but there are extensive forest tracts. Enormous deposits of coal, iron, and other minerals underlie the soil. The climate, while cold, is healthful and the summers are amply sufficient for the ripening of crops. The

whole region is capable of as rich a development as southern Canada.

The Russians made all haste to clinch their possession of this valuable region by carving it into provinces, opening navigation on the Ussuri, completing their telegraph line from Russia to the Pacific Ocean, and beginning extensive fortifications at Possiet Bay, twenty-five miles from the Korea frontier, and at Vladivostok on the Japan Sea. The latter, founded in 1860, was developed into a veritable Gibraltar. Special encouragement was given to Russian colonists in many parts of Siberia. The Government assisted families to meet the expense of the journey, and in many instances gave free passage, provided temporary accommodations on their arrival, gave each family two or three hundred acres of land, sold necessary agricultural implements at cost price on long-time payments, made a loan of six hundred roubles when needed, to run for thirty-two years without interest, and exempted the men from military service for the same period. Five million dollars are said to have been spent in promoting immigration in a single year. The result of this policy was a steady stream of Russian immigrants. Two

million settlers were added to the population of Siberia within three years. Farms were tilled, horses, sheep, and cattle multiplied, and towns rapidly grew.

All the time the Russians were employing every possible art to make an impression upon the Chinese. Their representatives in various cities and particularly in Peking erected palatial residences, entertained with prodigal liberality, made friends with officials of every grade, assiduously disseminated the idea that all the achievements of the white races had originated in Russia, that the highest political and intellectual conceptions, the most useful inventions, the greatest wealth, the deadliest weapons, and the most formidable army and navy were Russian, and that such a nation was a powerful and liberal friend and a most dangerous enemy. Let a loyal Russian, Vladimer Holmstrem, political leader—writer for the "St. Petersburg Viedomosti," tell us how his countrymen regarded their aggressions in the Far East: "Without going so far as to maintain that unselfish Christian love was the sole motive power that actuated the Russians in Asia, we are bound to admit that Russian conquest was rendered easy by the feeling of

solidarity which always existed in a latent state between the natives and their conquerors and often animated the latter with a half-conscious inclination in favour of the conquered. . . . This alone illustrates the saying that Russia is essentially an Asiatic country; her destiny is closely connected with that of Asia, and therein lies the main source of our predominance in that continent. . . . Russia's progress through Asia has been nothing else than the consolidation by means of true civilization and organized thought, properly expressed in institutions, of a vast empire peopled by races of common origin. . . . We cannot say that we have obtained all that we are entitled to by our destiny and by the needs of our Empire. We think it would be better for all parties concerned if it were otherwise. The question as to Russia's ultimate object in the Far East may be answered very favourably for us, if our policy be judged by the character of our activity in Siberia in the course of the last century. . . . What are the conclusions we have arrived at? Simply these: That in the past, Russia has rendered enormous services to mankind in keeping in check the barbarians of Asia and

finally, through incessant strife, by breaking up their empires; that Russia's expansion in Asia was and is an instinctive movement boding peace; it is a natural peaceful development which, besides Russia, is to be found in two more cases only, China and the United States; that it is useless to oppose Russia in Asia and greatly preferable to associate one's self with her in her policy. Obstacles may be raised in Russia's path at all points, but the force of circumstances will in the long run sweep them all away." [1]

This is a complacent state of mind for a patriot to be in and a naïve notice to other nations that they would be wise if they "keep off the grass."

[1] Article: "Russia's Extension in Asia, Its History and Purpose," in "The Independent," New York, May 4, 1899.

IX

RUSSIA'S THOROUGHFARE TO THE FAR EAST—EXPERIENCES OF A TRAVELLER

ERE long the magnificent dream of the Trans-Siberian Railway began to float before the minds of far-seeing Russian statesmen. It was a daring conception to fling a road of steel across this illimitable wilderness; 5,426 miles of territory which the rest of the world regarded as a dreary waste of snow and sand. There was no population to patronize a railway, no freight traffic that would pay even for fuel for the locomotives. But those splendid dreamers had faith in the possibilities of Siberia. They deemed the line, too, a military necessity, worth as a political move all it would cost, consolidating Russian dominion in a region so distant that it could not otherwise be held, securing ascendancy in the Far East and affording access, which no rival could obtain and no foe prevent, to the heart of the Asiatic arena and the long-coveted

ocean port. Other European powers could reach the Far East only by a water route tedious in length and exposed to attack at a score of points; but with a railway across the continent, Russia would have a route under her exclusive control for the entire distance.

Inspired by these visions, Tsar Alexander III made memorable the seventeenth day of March, 1891, by signing the edict: "Let a railway be built across Siberia in the shortest way possible." Work was begun simultaneously at both ends. Vladivostok was selected as the eastern terminus, and the Tsaravitch, who was in Vladivostok at the time on a journey around the world, formally began construction by thrusting the first shovel into the ground May 12, 1891. The work of building was vigorously pushed, and in spite of the enormous difficulties that were involved, the railway was practically completed by 1902.

Whatever may be one's feelings regarding Russia's political aggressions in eastern Asia, there can be no doubt of the inestimable value of the Trans-Siberian Railway to the world. It not only opened an enormous region to settlement and development, but it forms a great

thoroughfare for international travel and commerce between Europe and the Far East. In peaceful times, many Americans as well as a large majority of Europeans prefer to avoid the long ocean voyage across the Pacific and to take the interesting land journey through Russia and northern Asia. The European War of course lessened the volume of foreign travel. The difficulty was chiefly at the European end, where the requirements of the military situation added strict regulations regarding the passage of foreigners, while the submarine menace inclined most travellers to keep away from the North Sea and the Atlantic. Passenger trains, too, were apt to be delayed by the greatly increased quantity of freight which was shipped to Russia by the Trans-Siberian route. In spite of these difficulties, however, the line was kept open, and travellers who could secure the necessary permits were booked through "subject to delays." The restoration of peace will undoubtedly see the tide of travel resumed in full strength. It may be of interest, therefore, to describe some of a traveller's experiences in journeying by this route under normal conditions.

One takes a railway train at Berlin for Moscow. He will probably wish to stop at least a day in the historic city of Warsaw, and he will certainly plan to spend several days in the far-famed city of Moscow, where the picturesque Kremlin, the old Tartar wall, the noble Cathedral and gorgeous churches, and the quaint shops and houses kindle the imagination. A side trip to Petrograd can be made in a night's ride, so that a short break in the journey will give one a glimpse of the capital of all the Russias; or one may go from Warsaw direct to Petrograd and from there down to Moscow.

In ordinary times, the Trans-Siberian express trains start from Moscow three times a week. Two are "Russian State Expresses," but the traveller who does not understand the Russian language should avoid them if possible, as there is seldom any one upon them who can speak English, and the accommodations, while fairly good, are not all that could be desired for a long journey. The other train is the weekly "Train de Luxe," composed of the sleeping cars of the Intertional Sleeping Car and Express Trains Company, and one or more of the guards and

dining-car waiters speak English. The cars are smaller and lighter than the American Pullman cars so that they do not glide so smoothly; but they are luxuriously equipped and they give the passenger more room than he can get in that low and unventilated abomination—an American sleeping-car berth. The first-class cars are divided into compartments for two travellers each, the upper berth being at right angles to the lower berth, so that the occupant of the latter has an open space above him, and either passenger can retire without inconvenience to the other. Each compartment contains a chair, a small table and a reading lamp, and there is a lavatory between each set of two compartments in addition to the lavatories at the ends of the car. This semi-private lavatory is the chief difference between the first and second-class accommodations. The second-class compartments are furnished in the same manner as the first class and have the same service. The compartments for two travellers are not quite as large as the first-class compartments, and there are some compartments for four. The only lavatories are those at the ends of the cars, and they are not always kept clean.

Both classes of cars are on the same train and have access to the same dining car. Indeed, it not infrequently happens that a single car will contain both first and second compartments. As a first-class ticket from Moscow to Harbin, including berth, costs $146.65, and a second-class ticket $95.80, the traveller who is not indifferent to money will wisely conclude that the difference in comfort is not serious enough to justify the additional expense of a first-class ticket.

The dining-car service is unexcelled. The Trans-Siberian cars are the only dining cars in the world in which I have obtained really good coffee. The tea is also good, and the bread and butter are excellent. Russians are heavy meat eaters, so that vegetables and fruit are not as prominent on the bill of fare as with us; but, on our dining car at least, all food was admirably cooked and served. The prices were moderate, 55 kopecks (27 cents) for a plain breakfast of rolls and coffee; a rouble (50 cents) for a luncheon of several courses, and a rouble and a quarter for as good a dinner as any reasonable man could ask. To feast on broiled Mongolian pheasant while comfortably riding over the steppes of

Siberia is an interesting experience. Tea, coffee, cheese, and fruit are not included in these prices, but can be obtained by paying extra. West of Irkutsk the whole schedule was a trifle higher. Plain drinking water will be avoided by the prudent traveller. Many passengers use it and survive; but Russians, like most Europeans, drink little water and seldom exercise care about its purity. The temperate man who does not wish to take all his liquids in the form of tea or coffee, buys bottled carbonated water on the train at rather a high price, unless he has been thoughtful enough to have a case put in his compartment before starting. Boiling water can be obtained from the dining car and at the station stops, so that this wholesome beverage is always available.

Luggage is an unmitigated nuisance and a serious expense. In Russia, only fifty-five pounds are carried free in the luggage-van on a first-class ticket, and double this weight on through tickets between points in western Europe and the Far East. An almost unlimited number of hand pieces, however, can be taken into one's compartment, and the experienced traveller puts most of his luggage into bags

for this purpose, knowing that he will save not only money but trouble with customs' inspecors. America is not the only country which has exasperating customs regulations. Russian laws are as exacting as ours, and they are enforced with even greater strictness. Small pieces that one has in his compartment are usually examined on the train without inconvenience to the traveller, but pieces carried in the luggage-van are taken from the train at every frontier and carried into the station. The traveller must leave his car, no matter at what time of the night the frontier may be reached, identify and open his trunks, and after the examination has been made, he must have his belongings put back on the train. Porters are supposed to do this, but if he does not see that they do it and give them the expected fee, he will probably arrive at his destination without his luggage. Even at stations where luggage is not supposed to be taken off, it is well to keep an eye on the van, for trunks are often put off at the wrong place, and once lost it is difficult and sometimes impossible to trace them.

A printed advertisement of the International Sleeping Car Company solemnly as-

sured me that "each adult passenger holding International Ticket I or II class through to points in Europe, etc., is entitled to 110 pounds of personal luggage registered free in the baggage car; which may be checked through to ticket destination, with Customs' examination ONLY at the frontier of the country of destination." On the basis of this pleasing prospect, I bought through tickets from Shanghai to Berlin, checked and registered our two steamer trunks to Berlin, and boarded the train at Harbin with the placid assurance that I would have no trouble with the Russian Customs inspectors. Experience in wandering about this vale of tears had taught me that eternal vigilance is the price of luggage in Asia; therefore at the Russia-Manchuria frontier I strolled into the customs room with the other passengers, though secretly chuckling that I was not to have the trouble that was in store for them. My trunks were there with the others! I found the chief inspector and called his attention to the fact that they were registered through to Berlin and guaranteed to be exempt from examination. He replied that this made no difference and that they must be examined. I

drew from my pocket the printed statement of the International Sleeping Car Company and showed it to him. He said that the Company had no right to issue such statements, that all luggage, no matter how registered, was invariably examined on entering Russia; that the passenger might change his mind about stopping in Russia, etc. Expostulations were useless and my trunks were opened like those of everybody else. Even a British Consul whose luggage was registered through to London had all his pieces opened. I thought that the examination might be for the Chinese export duty, but in response to my inquiry, the inspector said that he was a representative of the Russian Government. The inspectors of the Chinese Imperial Customs were present and followed the Russian inspectors around to see if anything were going out of China on which export duty should be collected; but they did not make a separate examination, apparently assuming that if nothing dutiable were going into Russia nothing was going out of China. The examination, however, was courteously conducted. I had heard that inspectors were particularly sensitive about books and manuscripts, and I shivered for my

note books which contained copious observations on Far Eastern affairs including many references to Russia; but the inspectors gave me no trouble.

Unhappy is the pilgrim who, having checked his trunks through to his destination, stops en route to see some interesting place and allows his luggage to go on without him. His trunks are taken off at the frontier, and as he is not there to look after them, there they remain. When he arrives, perhaps at midnight, his belongings have been "safely" stored in some unknown room, probably under hundreds of other pieces. As there may be no one around who can act as his interpreter, he is likely to have an experience in finding them which will throw him into an unregenerate state of mind, even if he does not see his train pull out before the search is successful. The prudent wayfarer will see that at all hazards his pieces are on his train. I kept mine with me without sacrificing the through allowance of 110 pounds, by the simple expedient of taking my trunks from the train when I stopped over and leaving them unopened in charge of the station master until I resumed my journey. I was solemnly told that I could

not do this; but I did, although I admit that some "palavering" was occasionally necessary. If I were to take the Trans-Siberian route again, I would not carry a trunk at all, but would pack my impedimenta into suit cases, carryalls, and Japanese telescope baskets, and stow them in my compartment.

One who takes the precautions that have been indicated can take the Trans-Siberian route with little annoyance and he will have many delightful experiences. The scenery roughly resembles that which one sees in travelling across Canada from Halifax to Vancouver; the same alternations of mountains and valleys, rivers and forests, and plains which appear to be illimitable. Our train skirted Lake Baikal in the early morning before daylight, and in the soft radiance of a full moon the view was indescribably beautiful. Siberia is not the bleak and inhospitable region that many imagine it to be, but a land of varied charms and one destined to have a rich development.

The Trans-Siberian trains run to the terminus at Vladivostok, but that is about as inconvenient for the average traveller as a landing at Halifax on a trip from London to New

Orleans. Steamers run from Vladivostok to Japan in two days, but that route misses China and Chosen altogether. Most travellers prefer leaving the railway at Harbin. The Russian State train, to which one changes, is not very comfortable after the luxury of the Trans-Siberian Express, and there was no dining car; but clean and wholesome food can be bought at the station buffets en route, and the run to the Russian-Japanese line at Changchun is made in the daylight hours of one day. At that point, change is made to the American coaches and Pullman sleeping cars of the South Manchurian Railway, owned and operated by the Japanese. The trip to Mukden is comfortably made in a night. If one visits China before going to Chosen, he can take the train from Mukden direct to Peking in twenty-four hours. If he wishes to go first to Chosen or Japan, he can take a train from Mukden which runs southeast 188 miles to Antung on the Yalu River and thence through Chosen to Fusan, from which a steam ferry crosses the Korea Strait to Shimoneseki, Japan, in eight hours.

The entire journey from Berlin to Peking can be made in twelve days, from Berlin to

Seoul in thirteen days, and to Tokyo in fourteen. The trip is wearisome to some and of course is not so restful as a steamer in good weather. But one escapes ocean storms and he finds much to interest him on the way. Our journey was made in December and we were agreeably surprised by the mildness of the weather. We had expected to find a land of ice, deep drifts, and bitter cold; but we found very little snow, never enough to cover the rails or delay the train. Only when we were passing through the Ural Mountains was it as deep as ten inches. The lowest temperature was thirteen degrees below zero, and that only for a couple of days in the Ural Mountains. The weather was about that of a New England December, with a dry tonic quality which was very invigourating and we experienced no more discomfort than would be expected in crossing the American Continent at that season on the Canadian Pacific Railway. The cars were well heated and electric lights made the long evenings cheerful for reading. Ventilation was our only trouble, for the windows were screwed down and the small ventilator in the ceiling was kept tightly closed by the guard unless we surreptitiously opened

it. Siberian summers are apt to be hot and dusty and to have plagues of flies and mosquitoes; but the spring and fall months are as delightful as one can find anywhere. An ideal way is to make the journey around the world, going via the Trans-Siberian Railway and returning by steamer across the Pacific Ocean.

Such a journey is an education. It broadens sympathies as well as knowledge. The thoughtful man cannot cross continents and oceans and see peoples of many types of race, religion, civilization, and customs without gaining wider and truer conceptions of the world and its inhabitants, a deeper interest in humanity and a juster idea of his own duty toward it. One will probably come back with the feeling that there is no place like home; but he will realize that his own home does not form as large a proportion of the earth as he had imagined—a truth that the average American needs to learn.

X

ATTITUDE OF OTHER NATIONS TOWARD THE NEW RUSSIA

CURRENT statements that the Revolution should be interpreted in terms of the European War as a revolt against German intrigue require modification. There is no doubt that German spies were as numerous in Russia as they were in other countries and that they did everything in their power to induce Russia to break away from her Allies and conclude a separate peace. It is also true that the powerful Tsarina and several of the deposed cabinet ministers were believed to favour this. A few were suspected of German sympathies or of receiving German gold. Others felt that Russia was faring badly in the war, that the outcome was uncertain, and that it might be wiser to ascertain whether Russia's real object could not be secured at once by some adjustment with Germany than to run the risks which a continuance of the war would involve. German secret

agents actively fostered this sentiment and urged the opening of negotiations. The leaders of the Duma, however, favoured a vigorous prosecution of the war as an undertaking to which the nation had committed itself and from which it would be neither honourable nor practicable to withdraw at that stage. They felt keenly, too, the humiliation of the severe reverses which the Russian armies had sustained and the added sufferings of the soldiers from insufficient food and equipment. Accordingly the Provisional Government publicly announced March 18, and again May 19, that Russia would loyally adhere to her obligation as one of the Entente Allies and would "fight by their side against the common enemy until the end, without cessation and without faltering."

But this controversy was an incident of the Revolution rather than its efficient cause. The revolutionary movement started a full century ago. Its prime movers in 1917 were progressive men before the war broke out. They simply took advantage of the opportunity which the war afforded. Their principal grievance was the autocracy itself and the iniquities for which it stood. The people

had suffered long and grievously, but when unscrupulous officials manipulated abundant food supplies and transportation facilities for their own enrichment while multitudes were starving, patience ceased. Hungry men are proverbially desperate, and in Petrograd they thronged the public places angrily crying: "Give us bread!" In an announcement, March 18, Foreign Minister Milyukoff spoke of the "fall of the old political régime in Russia, which collapsed lamentably in the face of popular indignation provoked by its carelessness, its abuses and its criminal lack of foresight. The unanimity of resentment which the order of things now at an end had aroused among all healthy elements of the nation has considerably facilitated the crisis."

Germany heard of the Revolution with mingled relief and consternation. There was relief because it was immediately clear that such a political upheaval would paralyze the military aggressiveness of Russia, for a time at least, and thus lessen the pressure on the eastern front and enable Germany to strengthen her line against the British and French on the west.

But this feeling of relief was soon over-

shadowed by consternation as it became evident that the Revolution meant the downfall of a throne based on the assumption that a monarch rules by divine right, and that the whole democratic movement throughout Europe had received an enormous impetus. The manifestations of that movement in Germany had been causing the Government no small anxiety for a good while. Increasing numbers of the German people were restive under the autocratic sway of the Prussian military caste and the frequent declarations of the Kaiser to the effect that he considered himself the Lord's Anointed and that he derived his power not from men but directly from Heaven. Critical voices in the Reichstag were becoming louder and the Socialist Party was waxing stronger and bolder.

The outbreak of the great War at first strengthened the hands of the Government. Whatever differences of opinion there may be regarding the Kaiser's egotism and the validity of his claims, friends and foes alike recognize his extraordinary ability and force of character. Not a mediocrity he, like the Tsar of Russia, nor an amiable gentleman like some other kings, but a masterful personality.

The German people, Socialists as well as others, laboured under the impression that they were attacked by a powerful combination of nations under the leadership of England and that their only hope of victory lay in putting aside their differences and uniting under the guidance of the Imperial House. The military caste was, therefore, given free rein, and it looked for a time as if absolutism would be more firmly entrenched than ever and the cause of democracy set back for decades.

Then came the thunderbolt of the Russian Revolution, showing that even in the midst of terrific war, the common people could successfully assert their rights. Of course the Russian Socialists and Democrats had a special reason for revolt at that particular time which the corresponding parties in Germany did not have; for the Russian autocracy was bringing disaster upon the nation by its corrupt inefficiency. No one can accuse the German autocrats of inefficiency. Their governmental organization was the most perfect fighting machine that the world has ever seen; or ever will see, we devoutly hope. But the masses of the German people could not be indifferent to the significant fact that, with

the huge mass of triumphant Socialists and Democrats on one side of them in Russia and the free French and British peoples on the other side, their form of government was an anachronism, a survival of a vanishing era and completely out of harmony with the great tendencies of the modern world. The military autocrats were not so blind as to fail to read the signs of the times. When President Wilson and Prime Minister Lloyd-George publicly declared that the Allies were not disposed to fight the German people, that their real enemy was Prussian militarism, and that terms of peace could be more easily arranged if the German people would throw off the incubus of an imperialistic absolutism and take their due place among the free peoples of the earth, the House of Hohenzollern and its princes and dukes began to see the handwriting on the wall. The effect of the Russian Revolution upon Germany, therefore, is to strengthen the democratic movement and to hasten its inevitable triumph.

In America, the Revolution was welcomed with unmodified joy. Sympathy with the oppressed Russian people had long been deep. The Russian form of government was alien

to the most cherished convictions of the American people, and they exulted in its downfall. Manifestations of this sympathy were quick in appearing. Money and supplies were copiously poured out to help. Experts in transportation and manufacturing were hurried across the ocean to aid in reorganizing railways and increasing the output of munitions; and a Commission of America's most representative and trusted men was sent to Russia to give personal expression to the sympathetic interest of the American nation.

In Great Britain and France, the free spirit of the people also rejoiced that Russia had ceased to be a despotic monarchy and had taken her place among the progressive nations. Great Britain had special reason to rejoice, for the alliance with Russia in the reign of King Edward VII had been an unpleasant political necessity caused by the ascendancy of German influence in Turkey. The Kaiser had visited that country in 1898. Imposing ceremonies were celebrated in Constantinople, and magnificent gifts were distributed. The Holy Land was visited with elaborate pomp, and at Damascus, November 8, the Kaiser said to the bloody Sultan Abdul-Hamid: "May His Maj-

esty, the Sultan, as well as the 300,000,000 Mussulmen who venerate him as their Khalifa, be assured that the German Emperor is their friend forever." In these circumstances, Great Britain and Russia found it to their interest to lay aside their old feud for a time and to unite against the Power which threatened ruin to both.

When the great War which broke out in 1914 justified British apprehensions of Germany's designs, many men in Great Britain made Russia's aid in the hour of peril a cloak of charity which covered a multitude of Slavic sins, and tried hard to convince themselves that, after all, Russia might not be as dangerous as they had feared. When a former enemy fights on one's side in a life and death struggle, it is easy to feel that he was misjudged. A wave of gratitude swept over the land for assistance which prevented Germany from concentrating her whole strength against Great Britain and France. Some of the fine Christian men of Great Britain visited Russia and of course were received with open arms. They saw everything through the halo of common interest in a terrific war and of that gracious hospitality which Russians so

well know how to show to distinguished visitors upon whom they wish to make a favourable impression. In such circumstances one is naturally impressed by the best aspects of a people's life, and the worst either fall into the background or are seen in remote perspective. The British listened with gratification to assurances that the corrupt bureaucracy of Russia "was really a German importation in the reign of Peter the Great and is foreign to the sentiment of the Russian people;" that "our only desire is that these smaller nationalities in the Near East shall live in peace and happiness, developing their own life as they desire and forever free from the terrible tyranny of Austria and her method of sowing mutual distrust amongst them"; and that "Russia does not want the Straits to close them but to keep them open and to welcome all there." One can imagine the emotions which such statements would excite in the Poles, the Finns, and the Jews, and one is curious to know what there is in Russian history to justify the belief that the Russia of the Tsar wanted to "keep open" and "welcome all" to any place on earth that she controlled.

Acquiescence in Russia's claim to Constantinople, in the event of the victory of the Allies, was the heavy price that the British Government had to pay to hold Russian support in the war with the Central Powers. The London Foreign Office was not eager to have this publicly known; but it could not be kept secret, and December 2, 1916, the Russian Premier, Trepoff, formally announced the agreement to the Duma as follows:

"I cannot refrain from touching upon a question which lies close to the heart of every Russian. For more than a thousand years Russia has stretched out southward toward a free outlet on an open sea—the keys of the Bosporus and Dardanelles; Oleg's shield over the gate of Constantinople—these have been the age-long dreams cherished in the hearts of the Russian people all through the different periods of its existence. . . . Well, those aspirations are ready for realization. The vital interests of Russia are as well understood by our loyal Allies as by ourselves, and that is why an agreeement which we concluded in 1915 with Great Britain and France, and to which Italy has adhered, established in

the most definite fashion the right of Russia to the Straits and to Constantinople. The Russian people should know for what they are shedding their blood, and, in accord with our Allies, the announcement of this agreement is made today from this tribune. I repeat that absolute agreement on this point is firmly established among the Allies."

This compact was a bitter dose for the British people. In spite of their generous effort to make the best of their alliance, they knew in their hearts that there was no bond of sympathy, no real unity of purpose between Great Britain and autocratic Russia except the awkward fact that it was to their joint advantage to act together against their common enemy. The ruling reactionaries in Russia cared nothing for the liberty, democracy, and rights of small nations which the British emphasized as their motives for waging the war. Russia wanted to loosen the Kaiser's grip on the Sultan and to gain Constantinople for herself. And now the very catastrophe which Great Britain had sought for generations to prevent was about to occur. Englishmen sometimes scoff at Bernard Shaw, the

l'enfant terrible of the Empire; but he touched them on a sore spot when he blurted out in January, 1917: "The day after the peace we shall be more afraid of Russia than of Germany; and all Europe will be more afraid of us than of any other single power. The rugged Russian bear will, from his new vantage ground of Persia and Poland and Constantinople, overshadow regions which, within my lifetime, we would have fought for to our last penny sooner than have left them under Russia's influence or that of Japan, much less of the two in alliance." And men of soberer judgment, like Lord Bryce and Sir Edwin Pears, who best knew what Russia really was and what her occupation of Constantinople would mean, did not conceal their misgivings. Sir Edwin Pears boldly said: "It would be much better for Russia herself not to have Constantinople and the Dardanelles, for the possession will mean more friction and more war."[1] Some others in Great Britain and many well-informed men in America saw no reason to change their views regarding Russia because an unchanged autocracy deemed that

[1] Interview in the New York Times, December 17, 1916.

the opportune time had arrived to realize its age-old ambition to seize Constantinople and to make itself dominant in southeastern Europe and the Near East.

We can imagine, therefore, with what relief the Russian Revolution was welcomed in Great Britain as well as in America. The elements which had made Russia a menace to the world were cast out, and the democratic peoples of western Europe and North America instantly found themselves bound to the new Russia with bonds of real brotherhood. Prime Minister Lloyd-George, in the address in Glasgow referred to in a preceding chapter, expressed his gratification that "Russia is now unshackled; Russia is free, and the representatives of Russia at the Peace Congress will be representatives of a free people, fighting for freedom, arranging the future of democracy on the lines of freedom." [1]

The British are far less worried now about Russia's desire to obtain Constantinople, for democratic Russia is a friend in a sense that autocratic Russia was not. But their best informed men are not comfortable about it yet. Their discomfort is partly due

[1] Address in Glasgow, June 29, 1917.

to the fact that they do not know what kind of a government will emerge out of the present chaos in Russia, and partly to the fact that they do know that the best conceivable government is not likely to be composed of men so altruistic in sentiment that they will prefer British interests to Russian. As I have already intimated, Russia at Constantinople would dominate the eastern Mediterranean and the entrance to the Suez Canal, the vital artery between Great Britain and India. The British are quite as sensitive about that artery as Americans are about the Panama Canal. If one wonders what America would do if even its best friend in all the world, Great Britain, should seek a base that would enable her to command the entrance to the Panama Canal, he can resolve his doubt by recalling that when President Grover Cleveland suspected that England was trying to obtain further territory by "rectifying the boundary" between British Guiana and Venezuela, he warned her to stop instanter, declared that if there was to be any change in the boundary, the United States would determine what it should be, asked Congress to appoint a Commission for this purpose, and intimated that

the whole power of the United States Government would be used if necessary to enforce the Commission's decision.

The questions which the world is anxiously discussing just now are: What will be the effect of the Russian Revolution upon the European War? Will Russia make a separate peace with Germany? The Prime Minister of Great Britain gave his opinion on the first question when he said: "No doubt startling events in Russia modified the military situation this year, temporarily to our disadvantage. . . . The Russian Revolution, beneficent as it undoubtedly is, and undoubtedly great as will be its results both this year and even more hereafter, has had the effect of postponing a complete victory. . . . Although this distraction has had the effect of postponing complete victory, it has made victory more sure than ever. What is more important, it has made surer than ever the quality of the victory." [1]

The second question has a vital bearing upon the first. A separate peace with Germany would certainly be disastrous to the Entente Allies, for it would not only free the

[1] Address in Glasgow, June 29, 1917.

Central Powers from all pressure on their eastern front and enable them to send heavy re-enforcements against the French and British lines, but it would open to them the immense food, oil, coal, iron, steel, and chemical resources of Russia and thus strengthen them so they could never be defeated. Was this direful contingency to occur? Who could tell? The British and French and American Governments discussed the question with anxiety not unmingled with alarm. Fighting on the eastern front practically stopped for several months after the Revolution and German and Austrian agents did everything in their power to bring about a separate peace. A friend of mine who spent six months in Russia at that time, and in whose judgment I have large confidence, stated on his return that he had received the impression that "if the Germans would concede Constantinople to Russia, the Slav would favour a separate peace at once." "If!" Aye, there's the rub, for Germany wants Constantinople herself, not only because of its strategic value but because its possession is essential to the magnificent German ideal of a Berlin-to-Bagdad empire, the connecting link between the Euro-

pean and Asiatic sections of Mitteleuropa.

The Congress of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies of all Russia demanded early peace for broader reasons in the following resolution which was proposed by the Socialists and adopted by an overwhelming majority June 26:

"The present war arose in consequence of aspirations of imperialists, prevailing among the ruling classes of all countries and tending toward the usurpation of markets and submission to their economic and political influence of small and decadent nations. The war is leading to complete exhaustion of the peoples of all countries and is placing the Russian Revolution on the edge of a precipice. While making millions of victims and absorbing billions of the wealth of the country, it threatens to increase still more the disorder in which Russia was left by the old régime, leading to famine and turning the country from productive labour for consolidation of its newly-won liberty.

"The Congress recognizes consequently that the struggle for more rapid ending of the war constitutes the most important problem for the revolutionary democracy—a problem im-

posed as much by the interests of the Revolution as by the aspirations of the workers of all countries to put an end to mutual extermination and restore their fraternal union for the common struggle for complete liberation of humanity.

"The Congress recognizes, first, that ending the war by means of the defeat of one of the belligerents would constitute the point of departure for fresh wars, increase dissensions among the nations and lead them to complete exhaustion, famine, and ruin; second, that a separate peace would strengthen one of the belligerents and give it the possibility of gaining a decisive victory over the others, would strengthen aspirations toward usurpation by the ruling classes, and while liberating Russia from the grip of world-wide imperialism, would hinder international unification of workers. Consequently the Congress categorically rejects every policy tending in fact to the conclusion of a separate peace or to its prelude, a separate armistice."

Has revolutionary Russia abandoned the national purpose to obtain Constantinople? Affirmative replies might be cited. Certain

revolutionary leaders have suggested that Constantinople be made an international port and that the Dardanelles be open to the ships of all nations. Some enthusiastic writers in Great Britain and America, with whom the wish is father to the thought, have construed the declaration of the Provisional Committee of the revolutionary government April 10, 1917, referred to on a preceding page, as a pledge that the new Russia will not seek any additional territory. But one must be very unsophisticated indeed to imagine that the deeply-rooted character and aspirations of a nation have been radically altered so quickly.

Even if the declaration of the Provisional Committee be taken at its face value, it is an exceedingly violent assumption that it carries any pledge to abandon Russian claims to Constantinople, for Russia has never believed that the Moslems have a right to that city. They are regarded as alien conquerors who should be expelled in the interest of the peoples whom they are "depriving of their national patrimony." Russia no more thinks of Constantinople as properly belonging to the Turks than the French think of Alsace and Lorraine as properly belonging to the Ger-

mans. The revolutionists are Russians before all else, and as Russians they share the common and intense national aspiration for Constantinople.

Let us not deceive ourselves. Russia proposes to have Constantinople, if not now then later, and any solution of pending international problems which does not take this fact into account will be of short duration. It would be too much to expect that Russia has suddenly become wholly altruistic. Like other nations, she will continue to be actuated by a self-interest more or less enlightened and by an unshaken confidence in her destiny. Even the progressive and travelled Count Ilya Tolstoy has said: "We Russians have the intuition, we have the moral and spiritual greatness, and when to that is added political power and education, you will see that we will become the greatest people in the world." [1] Constitutionally governed Great Britain and republican France and America have their ideas of national necessities as well as other peoples, and are quite as ready to insist upon them if necessary. International relations are not yet governed by Christian principles. But

[1] Interview in the New York Times, April 21, 1917.

there is a vast difference between the autocratic and democratic viewpoint in world affairs. The old Russia was a menace. Wherever its power extended, it asphyxiated the impulses of freedom. The new Russia will represent a progressive spirit and therefore we need not be so fearful of its influence at the council table of the nations and upon the development of southeastern Europe and northern Asia. The new era cannot possibly be as bad as the old, and every friend of Russia should heartily co-operate in helping to make it a better one.

The revolutionary movement has made enormous strides since 1905. It has acquired greater momentum, is more ably led, and has a broader basis in popular support. Everywhere the democratic movement has showed extraordinary vigour and power. Within the brief span of eight years, the Sultan of Turkey was deposed, the Empire of China was transformed into a Republic, Portugal banished its dissolute King, and the imposing structure of Russian autocracy tumbled into ruin. The day of kings by divine right is passing, let us hope forever. Russia may be slow to settling down to stable order;

but she will not go back to what she was before.

One thinks with eager longing of a renewed Russia—a great people who, having cast off the iron shackles of despotism, will go forward to the realization of those high ideals for which so many of their noblest souls toiled and suffered and died. What further trials await them, how long and rough the upward road must be before the goal can be attained, none can now foresee. But the start has been made, the stern determination to press on, the magnificent courage for facing every danger are not wanting; and millions of earnest men and women in other lands are saying to their struggling Russian brethren: May God bless and speed you!

One more consummation is now to be greatly desired—that the House of Hohenzollern and the House of Hapsburg should join the retirement of the House of Romanoff, so that the great German and Austrian peoples also may take their due places among the free and self-governing democracies of the world.

INDEX

Printed in the United States of America